JPRS 78941

10 September 1981

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 7, May 1981

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

JPRS 78941

10 September 1981

USSR REPORT

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 7, May 1981

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

May They Live Through the Ages..... 1

Opening Address at Ideological Seminar
(M. A. Suslov)..... 13

Universal-Historical Experience of the Workers Movement:
Results and Problems of Scientific Research..... 19

Stages in the Process of the Building of Socialism in the USSR
(M. Kim)..... 33

In the Spirit of Revolutionary Traditions
(Jan Fojtik)..... 44

Significant Date in the History of the Romanian Workers Movement
(N. Aleksandrov)..... 58

Lessons of the Past and Concerns of the Present
(P. Zhilin)..... 66

Creative Power of Leninist Thought and Today's Capitalism
(Yu. Ostrovityanov)..... 84

'Armed Propaganda': An Alliance Between Ultraleft Extremism and Rightist Forces..... 103

Let Us Master the Leninist Work Style
(K. U. Chernenko)..... 113

Continuation of Publicistic Leniniana
(G. Brovman)..... 123

Study of the Methodological Foundations of Party Policy
(V. Shapko)..... 129

Young People in Science
(A. Golubev)..... 132

New Documents on the Heroism of the Soviet People
(D. Antonyuk)..... 136

Labor Exploit of the Grain Growers
(N. Plakhotnyy)..... 141

Historical Path of the CPCz
(G. Karpov)..... 144

Creative Approach to Topical Problems
(Ye. Ambartsumov)..... 148

School Responsibility and the 'Happy' Percentage
(M. Tetel'baum)..... 157

In the Aftermath of KOMMUNIST Publications..... 160

PUBLICATION DATA

English Title	: TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 7 May 1981
Russian Title	: KOMMUNIST
Author (s)	:
Editor (s)	: R. I. Kosolapov
Publishing House	: Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"
Place of Publication	: Moscow
Date of Publication	: May 1981
Signed to Press	: 5 May 1981
Copies	: 908,000
COPYRIGHT	: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," "Kommunist," 1981

MAY THEY LIVE THROUGH THE AGES

Moscow KOMMUNIST No 7, May 81 pp 3-13

[Text] The rhythms of time are rapid. The current of modern history flows tortuously and fast. Various sources and various streams merge and clash in this flow. It is not easy for the revolutionary stream to make its way through the stagnant waters of reaction. The path of social progress is difficult and at times troubled, but that makes socialist society's achievements all the more significant and outstanding, the feats of its builders and defenders all the more impressive and its growing beneficial influence on world development all the more evident.

On the scale of mankind's history it is still relatively recently--some 150 years ago--that many outstanding thinkers were expending considerable energy on wrestling with the solution of the secrets of social existence and trying to divine the direction of the underlying process of social life behind all the conflicts, zigzags and turns in the motley kaleidoscope of events, to examine the axis of its progress, which is impenetrable to the superficial glance, and to explain just how the wheel of history spins. Why does mankind pay so dearly for his every major step forward: at a cost of violence, innumerable sacrifices on the altar of social conflicts and wars, clashes between classes and nations, the suppression of the individual, the repression and decline of culture? Where is the human race going, what awaits it in the future? Only K. Marx and F. Engels were able to answer this age-old question. They substantiated with scientific reliability the paths of historical development, showing why everything was the way it was in the past and why society must not and cannot proceed any further in the dark. Society had already given birth to that great creative force--the industrial working class--which is capable of perceiving the unreasonable and inhuman nature of the system which had existed for centuries, of boldly setting about transforming it on a fundamentally different basis and of establishing and setting in motion a new, collectivist--socialist, communist--way of organizing society; a way of organizing society which gives humanist content to social progress, insuring an interrelationship between the means of achieving personal and social well-being, between people's individual and collective destinies.

In essence it was only after Great October that the concept of "social progress" itself ceased to be merely theoretical and divorced from the possibility of conscious influence to accelerate progressive changes and became filled with practical, vital meaning. In the new society it is no longer the result of diverse, multidirectional, conflicting, antagonistic processes, phenomena and events, of the spontaneous mingling of disjunctive human destinies, actions and wills. It is the organized movement of millions of working people--led by the

working class--pursuing a single, common cause under the leadership of the communist party--their genuinely revolutionary vanguard, which is forging the way to the establishment of complete social justice.

Real socialism, which is a new type of social progress, is inextricably linked throughout its history and in the present day with the name of Russia's greatest son, Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. An utterly loyal follower of Marx and Engels, the great proletarian revolutionaries and founders of the science of communism, Lenin followed in their wake, comprehensively developed Marxism at the level of contemporary needs and led the world revolutionary process, which was gathering strength. He looked so far ahead and forged so mighty an ideological and organizational weapon for the struggle to build a new world that even today and in the foreseeable future that weapon will serve the international working class reliably in the implementation of its worldwide historical liberating mission.

Not only the scope and depth, the truly boundless universality of Lenin's genius, but his inimitable makeup, the uniqueness of his indomitable nature and the charm of his personality embody, personify and crystalize the highest achievements and potential of many millenia of human civilization, the most powerful potentialities of our revolutionary era, the most cherished aspirations of millions of working people, the peoples' plans and desires. Lenin's name is a symbol of the world's revolutionary renewal, a concise and meaningful expression of the essence of the present era--the era of the triumph of Leninism.

When we ask ourselves, in the words of the poet, "What did he do? Who is he, where did he come from? Why is he so honored?", we recognize clearly that Lenin cannot be measured by ordinary yardsticks. Not because--as our class enemies assert--we are inclined to make fetishes of our leaders and deify them. Our attitude toward Lenin, our enthusiasm for his name and image have nothing in common with the "sigh of oppressed creatures," have not the remotest hint of the slavish worship of an ikon which so humiliates man--both great and ordinary. The Sormovo worker Petr Zalomov, who served as Gorkiy's prototype for the revolutionary Pavel Vlasov, wrote to N. K. Krupskaya: "We have buried all the old gods and we will never, ever create new ones! We have no intention of deifying Comrade Lenin--we are equal with him! We have merited such a leader and he, being worthy of us, has a right to be proud of us.... Comrade Lenin is a part of ourselves.

"He is organically linked with us and that link will strengthen as we become more familiar with his works and his personality."

Lenin gave classically perfect expression not to the superhuman but to all that is most human. It has long been said that a great man is one through whose very being, through whose mind, heart and nerves there passes the most profound dichotomy of his era, who is capable of feeling its contradictions and conflicts and perceiving the people's sufferings and their successes as his own pain and his own joy, of clearly seeing the direction of history's movement and of leading people by the shortest route.

Lenin was just such an individual, but in this sense he was incomparably greater than any other. That is why Lenin's thoughts and deeds have become the thoughts and deeds of millions. That is why the party he created can call its leader the

words which he called the party: the mind, honor and conscience of our era. With this simple and great idea in mind, we repeat Mayakovskiy's words today: "We say Lenin and mean the party, we say the party and mean Lenin." In light of the recent 26th CPSU Congress decisions, which illuminated in Leninist fashion the paths of our people's further movement toward communism, this truth has become still more evident and Lenin's formula about the party and our era is accepted even more profoundly.

No, we do not blindly worship Lenin's image. Everything in him is clear, there is nothing enigmatic or inaccessible in his thoughts and deeds. History cut the pure crystal of Lenin's genius with the hardest, most accurate instrument--the diamond cutter of the class struggle. That is why millions of people see features of their own social portrait in the image of Lenin, in his mind, character and will and in his revolutionary temperament. "All that is truly great and heroic in the proletariat--a fearless mind, an iron, inflexible, stubborn will that overcomes all, devout hatred, mortal hatred of slavery and oppression, the revolutionary passion which moves mountains, boundless faith in the masses' creative forces, tremendous organizational genius--all this was majestically embodied in Lenin, whose name has become a symbol of the new world from west to east, from south to north," says the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee address "To the Party; To All Working People" of 22 January 1924. "Our strength," Petr Zalomov wrote at that time, "lies precisely in the fact that our leader forms a single whole with us."

This is our priceless wealth, our common possession, which lives on in the party's and people's deeds and generally determines the steps and plans of every one of us, and which is to determine them still further as each year passes. In this we see the immortality of Lenin's ideas and cause, the immortality of his very image. The Lenin Mausoleum is built of stone which is not black--the color of mourning--but red--the color of our blood, our revolution, our banner.

In the years which have elapsed the strength of the unity of the Leninist party and the people, of Soviet society's cohesion, has increased many times over. New evidence of this was provided by the nationwide approval of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, which was another notable milestone in the historic creation of the builders of communism and an event of world significance. Its platform attracted the attention of not only Soviet people but all mankind--both those who treasure the ideals of peace and social progress and those who would like to ride roughshod over those ideals.

The whole world heard these words ringing out from the 26th congress platform. "Not preparations for war, which condemn the peoples to senseless expenditure of their material and spiritual wealth, but the strengthening of peace--that is our guiding thread toward tomorrow." "Moscow's new peace offensive"--that is how the international public has described the congress' foreign policy initiatives.

The domestic and foreign policy of our party and the Soviet state are comprehensible to everyone whose eyes are not clouded by the fog of unfounded myths and prejudices, since it is a principled policy, a consistent and firm policy, a policy guided by the programmatic slogan "Everything for the Sake of Man, for the Good of Man." It is a Leninist policy of communist creation and strengthening peace.

What is indicated by the fact that a political party, at its congress, discusses in broad and concrete terms an extremely wide range of questions--from measures to strengthen peace and the peoples' security and to defend their sovereign rights and freedoms to measures to increase the production of food products and consumer goods and to improve the work of stores, canteens and laundries? Does it indicate the belittling of politics or, on the contrary, the elevation of people's vital requirements and problems, needs and aspirations to the level of state problems, political problems? It takes no particular political flair, outstanding analytical capabilities or exceptional knowledge in the sphere of Soviet society's domestic living conditions to answer that question unequivocally. Concrete concern for real people--that is the party's priority cause; the starting point for our party political approach to the phenomena of social life, the Alpha and Omega of the communist political leadership of society. The Leninist party's policy has no special hidden meaning distinct from the direct, literal meaning which is confirmed by its orientation in practice toward improving the people's life, improving their material well-being and cultural level, preserving and consolidating detente and safeguarding peace. The CPSU's policy does not need to be deciphered, since its meaning, like its language, is accessible and comprehensible to everyone: it is the language of real humanism, that is, of the masses' vital interests, of reasonable requirements, of vitally significant goals and the fundamental laws of social development.

This policy is based on the principles and goals of the society of labor, the world outlook and morality of the working class--the leading force for social progress, its "social mind and social heart," to quote Marx. That force's viewpoint, the revolutionary ideology and morality, collectivist psychology and interests and ideals of the working class, which have now become the property of all strata of Soviet society, are scientifically expressed and implemented politically by the communist party.

The Leninist approach, the Leninist spirit, Leninist concern for the working people's fundamental, vital interests, Leninist principles, realism and optimism permeate the questions of our party's historic 26th congress. "Since the time," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said on closing the congress, "when the great Lenin founded our party it has been marching confidently along the path of building socialism and communism which he outlined." The more responsibly and critically the party assesses what was done in the seventies, the more strictly and thoroughly it considers the special features, opportunities and difficulties of the new decade and the further it looks into the future, the stronger is its need to consult with Lenin and to check its conclusions and plans against the teaching and example of the earth's most humane son. The dearer and more precious to all of us is his noble image. The awareness that Lenin is with us is a most important source of our confidence in tomorrow, since the genius of the revolution, the architect of socialism, the first builder of the new world has always been and remains, for us, our comrade in arms, Comrade Lenin.

Having summed up the results of our development in the seventies, discussed plans for the current five-year period and looked further ahead--up to 1990--the congress adopted decisions on which the face of our motherland at the end of the 20th century, on the threshold of the third millenium, will largely depend.

During these spring days communists and all working people in our country are studying the congress materials with profound attention, translating the congress' instructions into the language of concrete practical tasks for every labor collective and insuring that their own individual creative plans are in conformity with them. The working people responded with a powerful upsurbe of labor and social activeness to the congress' call for them to become involved in the tremendous work to implement its decisions and insure the unconditional fulfillment of the 11th Five-Year Plan. What does this require? "First and foremost," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stressed at the congress, "a high sense of responsibility and firm, really communist, conscious discipline. But of course, imaginative thinking, a tireless quest for what is new and support for what is new are equally necessary. Constant initiative is needed--initiative everywhere and in everything." As the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee resolution "On the All-Union Socialist Competition for the Successful Fulfillment and Overfulfillment of the 11th Five-Year Plan Targets" notes, everyone's motto must be "Work EFficiently and With High Quality!" The Leninist principles of the 26th party congress must find full, all-round embodiment in the concrete deeds of workers and kolkhoz members, engineers, technicians, scientific workers and all working people in industry, agriculture, construction, transportation and other sectors of the national economy.

The elaboration and implementation of a principled, class policy taking into account the general laws of social development and the particular features of the historical stage through which we are living are inconceivable without the creative enrichment of Marxist-Leninist teaching."

On the threshold of the 20th century Lenin stressed: "There can be no strong socialist party without a revolutionary theory uniting all socialists, from which they draw all their convictions and which they apply to their methods in the struggle and their methods of activity...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 4, p 183). Our party adheres unswervingly to this Leninist stance, advancing revolutionary science and supplementing it with new conclusions and generalizations. "We do not by any means regard Marx' theory as something complete and inviolable. We are convinced, on the contrary, that it only laid the cornerstones for the science which socialists must develop in all fields unless they wish to fall behind life" (op. cit., p 184).

In the materials of the 26th CPSU Congress Marxist-Leninist theory is further developed in all the decisive fields. The CPSU Central Committee's accountability report gives a profound scientific analysis of the present-day international situation and prospects for improving it, trends in the development of the world socialist system, the consolidation of cooperation among the socialist countries, the development of relations with the liberated countries and the world communist and workers movement, the exacerbation of the general crisis of capitalism, new phenomena in its economy and policy and the conditions for and ways of resolving urgent international problems.

The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the 110th Anniversary of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin's Birth" says: "The culmination of Lenin's theoretical creation was the science which he created on the ways of building socialism and communism." Following Leninist traditions, the congress devoted special attention to that

science, to the theoretical problems of developed socialism and to the scientific substantiation of the party's course in the eighties in the sphere of the economy, social relations and culture. The present-day achievements of Leninist science on the ways of building socialism and communism will be reflected in the new edition of the CPSU program. Fundamental significance is attached to the 26th congress' conclusion that the formation of a classless structure in society will take place by and large within the historical framework of mature socialism.

According to Lenin, "The main thing in Marx' teaching is the clarification of the worldwide historical role of the proletariat as the creator of socialist society" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol. 23, p 1). It is this central idea of Marxism-Leninism, together with its continuing and developing tenet that the revolutionary party of the working class is the working people's political vanguard in the struggle against capitalism and imperialism and for socialism and communism, which today defines the Leninist party's approach to the resolution of theoretical problems.

Looking at reality and seeing it from the angle of the working class's scientifically defined interests--that, according to Lenin's thinking, means incomparably more than simply expressing the opinion of a specific social stratum. The proletariat's viewpoint coincides with the needs of social progress and in the long term, gives the determining trend, with the interests of all mankind. In liberating itself the proletariat liberates all the oppressed, all mankind, and breaks down the barriers in the path of the development of an advanced civilization.

The enemies of Leninism have always reproached Lenin and reproach our party to this day for the "narrow," "restricted" nature of the class-party approach by which communists are guided. Nothing could be more unjust in essence or more historically inaccurate. For Lenin the proletarian class approach was always identified with the broadest scientific approach. Mayakovskiy spoke of this very aptly: "The concept of the proletariat is clumsy and narrow for those who regard communism as a snare."

It is regrettable that such expressions as "proletarian philosophy," "the political economy of the proletariat" (as opposed to the bourgeois political economy) and "proletarian socialism" are becoming rarer every day in our scientific vocabulary. For Lenin the concepts of "scientific socialism" and "proletarian socialism" were synonymous.

This is not only a question of terminology. Today as in Lenin's time there are plenty of people who are fond of counterposing to proletarian socialism all kinds of varieties and "models" of a nonproletarian socialism which nevertheless claims to be "scientific." The class sense of a particular "alternative socialist" teaching is the most correct, reliable guide to its relationship to scientific truth.

The question of the socialist future is of fundamental significance for our era. Capitalism, in its evolution, has approached the final limit and in parts of the world has already suffered complete bankruptcy. Many peoples and states at various stages of economic and cultural development have already embarked on a socialist path. Mankind has and can have no other prospects. The transition to socialism and

the ensuing elimination of exploitation and poverty, the anarchy of production and spiritual stagnation, the lack of social rights and national inequality accords with the cherished aspirations of the majority of working people.

Whereas in the times of Marx and Engels all world reaction closed ranks against the "specter of communism," in Lenin's lifetime the steadily growing prestige and popularity of the idea of socialism forced even many bourgeois figures to pretend to support it. The entire practice of anticommunist propaganda became more false and hypocritical. "Socialism" in general, as a goal, in contradiction to capitalism (or imperialism), Lenin wrote during World War I, is now acknowledged not only by all kinds of opportunists, but also by many bourgeois social politicians. "But now it is not a question of the general confrontation of two social systems, but of the concrete aim of a concrete 'revolutionary mass struggle' against a concrete evil..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, p 214). In our day that evil is, first and foremost, the antipopular, aggressive, antisocialist policy of the monopolies and of imperialism, above all American imperialism. The real or feigned revolutionary nature of particular ideological and political movements is defined in terms of their attitude to that policy.

To this day Leninist communists are waging a struggle against the influence on the masses of the reformist bourgeois "pocket socialism," which, renouncing Marxism and coming out as a bitter enemy of Leninism, has simply become a partly disguised form of anticommunism. Leninist polemics against the pillars of this current--Bernstein, Kautskiy and others--retain all relevance today. It contains irrefutable arguments against the ideological principles and tactics of parties which, while calling themselves "socialist," have long since grown into a political system of bourgeois society and act as a kind of piquant sauce on the monopolies' tables. The Swedish and Labor Party types of "socialism" and Sadat's and Begin's type of "socialism" are of this kind.

It is necessary to assimilate firmly the historical lesson that successes in socialist building and the growth of the influence of the international communist movement are accompanied by increasingly frequent attempts in one way or another to substitute petit bourgeois imitations for scientific communism. In the very first months after the October Revolution Lenin had to withstand a battle with "leftist communists"; the adventurist-bureaucratic methods of Trotskiyism threatened to thwart the implementation of the Leninist plan for building socialism; the rightwing movement sought to delay socialist transformations.

The emergence of these and similar opportunist tendencies is no accident. It is the other side of the mainly positive phenomenon that vast masses of peasantry, the urban petit bourgeoisie and part of the middle bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and the lumpen proletariat become involved in the world revolutionary process in the wake of the working class and alongside it. They all make their own demands on socialism (demands which naturally differ from those of the proletariat in the early stages) and are guided in their attitude toward it by their own traditions and customs, not immediately accepting it wholly and trying to snatch what they want and frequently to adapt Marxism to the petit bourgeois nationalist interests of individual strata or groups. Some of these elements of society, suffering from the oppression of big capital, seize on socialism without always being ready for a

consistent, difficult struggle and work. They sometimes hysterically demand "everything" today, not tomorrow, and either launch into reckless adventure or soon lose interest, capitulating to the class enemy. These are the "supporters" of socialism who, according to Lenin, by virtue of the laggardness of socioeconomic conditions, "assimilate only certain aspects of Marxism, only individual parts of the new world outlook or individual slogans and demands, without being capable of making a decisive break with all the traditions of the bourgeois world outlook in general and the bourgeois democratic outlook in particular" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 20, p 65). Bourgeois propaganda gambles on them increasingly in its acts of sabotage against the socialist countries.

For us communists these phenomena are nothing new, in whatever strange and caricatured forms they may be revived from time to time. It is well known that scientific socialism grew and strengthened in the principled struggle against all kinds of bourgeois and petit bourgeois pseudosocialist concepts. This struggle was waged by Marx and Engels, it was tirelessly waged by Lenin and is now waged by communist and workers' parties. The answer to the most vital, most urgent questions of today is found by Leninists in Marxist-Leninist ideas and their creative development and in the study of history and the experience of socialist building.

On the basis of these considerations it is vitally important to form a correct idea of the essence of socialism and the unity of its economic, political and ideological principles. It is with the aim of falsifying these principles that a widely conceived subversive ideological campaign has been launched in the West and the East and is being pursued by the bourgeois mass media and right-wing and "leftist" revisionism in class formation. These critics of Marxism-leninism, reflecting the interests of the doomed forces of the old society, are trying to pepper the monolithic bastion of scientific socialism with the buckshot of "socialisms" of the nationalist variety--from the antiproletarian, wishy-washy liberal "model" to the terrifying social-militarist regime of Mao Zedong's successors.

At every turning point in history we must recognize not only our open ideological opponents, but also those who, under cover of pseudosocialist slogans, want to prevent the working class and all the working people from achieving their historic goal. Lenin taught us this. You cannot successfully implement communist education and the ideological struggle without mercilessly exposing the false followers of socialism who are trying to eat away at the monistic scientific concept of the socialist system with the acid of ideological and political "pluralism."

Like Marx, Lenin in no way restricted future revolutionaries in their choice of specific ways and means of building the new society. True to the creative spirit of Marxism, he never regarded socialism as a finished system allegedly given to mankind by someone or other. At the same time Lenin delivered a speedy rebuff whenever anyone encroached on the common international principles by virtue of which socialism is called socialism. Lenin wrote: "We stand wholly on the ground of Marx' theory: for the first time it transformed socialism from a utopia into a science, established firm foundations for that science and outlined the path which must be followed to further develop that science and elaborate it in all particulars" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 4, p 182). Lenin associated scientific strictness on this question, like any other, with an implacably principled approach.

The "firm foundations" of the Marxist-Leninist teaching of socialism, backed up by the experience of successful socialist and communist building, are these: "There is," in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's words, "the working people's power with the vanguard role of the working class and the leadership of social development by the Marxist-Leninist party. There is social ownership of the means of production, and on that basis the planned development of the entire national economy at a high technical level in the interests of all the people's well-being. There is the implementation of the principle from each according to his capabilities, to each according to his labor. There is the education of the whole people in the spirit of the ideology of scientific communism, in the spirit of friendship with the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries and working people throughout the world. Finally, there is a foreign policy based on the principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism.

"All these general, fundamental signs of socialism are of decisive significance."

Naturally, such a concise formulation can only hint at the full diversity of socialist social relations. Here it is a question of the basic requirements which must be met by a society calling itself socialist. Attempts to bypass one or another of these "parameters" by means of an arbitrary interpretation of Marxist-Leninist teaching on socialism are an indication of infantile utopianism or malicious intentions on the part of those making such attempts. Socialism cannot be built on economic, sociopolitical and ideological principles which are mutually contradictory. Attempts to "unite" socialism with bourgeois, private ownership "freedom" or with a military-bureaucratic dictatorship or to turn it into an instrument for the attainment of any nationalist or--still more--great-power aims are contrary to the nature of our system and are doomed to failure.

The general laws of the building of the new society--laws which have passed through an international practical test--were revealed for the first time in the ideas of socialist industrialization, cooperativization and cultural revolution elaborated by Lenin. Present-day problems of socialist and communist creation and the objective logic of the ideological and political struggle today can only be understood by sensing and comprehending the link between all levels and stages of the revolution in a particular country and the world revolutionary process as a whole--only on the basis of the consistent historic approach of Marxist-Leninist science.

The fundamental difference between socialism and all previous social systems lies in the conscious, purposeful guidance of society's development. Lenin noted that in the absence of a goal set in advance and defined accurately, in the absence of an appropriate strategy for attaining it, in the absence of a plan for a prolonged period, socialism cannot take a single step foward. He taught communists to elaborate a program of actions and methods of organizing the masses depending on the "level of economic maturity of communism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 33, p 98).

A passionate revolutionary romantic and a sanguine politician, Lenin called for only thoroughly considered, feasible tasks to be set before the masses. "Strictly distinguishing the different stages and soberly researching the conditions of their progress," he noted, "does not mean postponing the final goal indefinitely or slowing down the pace beforehand" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 9, p 131). Lenin

was clearly aware that the working class' coming to power marks only the start of the transition period from capitalism to socialism, not socialism itself, the building of whose foundations is a process requiring much work and considerable time. With its completion the new system develops in the direction of increasing maturity and gradually reaches the stage which Lenin defined as "developed socialist society," "complete socialism," "full socialism," "socialist society in its developed form" and "whole socialism." A developed socialist society, gradually developing into a communist society, has now been created in the Soviet Union and is being built in a number of other fraternal countries.

Lenin was implacable and unshakable on questions concerning revolutionary convictions and fundamental scientific and political concepts. While being far removed from dogmatism and always ready to make amendments to theoretical provisions and tactical directives if changed circumstances really required it, at the same time he always expressed legitimate distrust of the irresponsible slogan "freedom of criticism" put foward by opportunists trying to shake the edifice of Marxist teaching and corrupt the proletariat's class awareness.

Lenin is notable for his special scientific conscientiousness and sense of responsibility. He could not allow himself to replace any tenet of Marx and Engels with a different one at his own discretion and without a convincing explanation of the reasons. Every time, on summing up new phenomena and seeing the need for conclusions not drawn by his great teachers or revising their specific historical assessments, he always frankly explained the conditions and proved the need for it. Lenin displayed exceptional delicacy with respect to the classical heritage even when making his own small contribution to it, be it the elaboration of a more detailed teaching on the revolutionary workers' party or the supplementation of Marx' "Das Kapital" with an analysis of imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism, or the revelation of the possibility of victory for socialism in an individual country or of such a previously unknown form of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the republic of soviets.

In early 1917, on reading Engels' work "On the Housing Question" and drawing attention to the hypocritical lamentations of opportunists to the effect that Marxism was allegedly growing "decrepit," Lenin wrote these remarkable lines to I. F. Armand: "Do you know what? It is delightful! I am still 'in love' with Marx and Engels, and I cannot suffer any abuse of them in silence. No, they are real people! We must learn from them. We must not break away from that ground" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 49, p378).

Lenin ridiculed the "desire of radical-thinking individuals to combine what is old and outmoded with what is lifeless and new...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 2, p 440) and proposed consistently traveling those reliable paths which are indicated by the proletarian, dialectical materialist world outlook and methodology, the interests of the proletariat's class struggle and the demands of steadily developing social reality.

In present-day conditions the Leninist party, in elaborating the concept of developed socialism in strict accordance with the basic premises of our revolutionary teaching, has made a major contribution to the treasure house of Marxism-Leninism. With its experience and its progress in all spheres of public life, our

country has a powerful and diverse influence on the course of world processes. Soviet communists and Soviet people are aware of the fact of this influence as well as of their responsibility for the destinies of socialism.

In speaking of the triumph of Leninism mention must be made of its tremendous moral force, which is inseparable from the force of Lenin's example and Lenin's model.

One of Lenin's distinctive features was his fearlessness in the face of the truth, whether it be gratifying or harsh, and his ability to look the truth in the face without embellishing it or hiding behind smart phraseology. He believed that it is not the difficulties which the party, the working class and the working people must overcome at each step that are dangerous, but that it is errors and self-deception which are pernicious. Lenin numbered among the essential qualities for a revolutionary communist the ability to frankly admit his own mistakes and learn from them, making skillful use of the weapon of criticism and self-criticism. Lenin made particularly tough demands on party members after the October Revolution, when our party became the ruling party and when the eyes of all working people were turned toward it as the collective inspirer and organizer of the defense of the socialist fatherland and the building of a new society. He wrote: ".... If we are to teach discipline to the workers and peasants with a clear conscience, we must begin with ourselves" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 50, p 63). Lenin taught that it is necessary for the nonparty masses to see that "members...of the communist party have duties, and communists do not admit new party members so that they can enjoy the advantages associated with the position of the government party, but so that they can set an example of really communist labor...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 380). The words of the CPSU Central Committee's accountability report rang out with genuinely Leninist principles at the 26th party congress: "It must be stressed with full force: our attitude toward those who conduct themselves unworthily and violate the party rules and the norms of party morality has been, is and will remain implacable. There can be no allowances for anyone when it is a question of our party's honor and prestige and the purity of its ranks!"

The Leninist work style, whose significance was discussed at the 26th CPSU Congress, engenders and nurtures the spirit of collectivism, comradeship, and mutual sensitivity and exactingness. Lenin was implacable toward the least manifestations of bureaucracy, formalism, high-handed arrogance, bureaucratic administration and self-conceit. He never resolved problems of principle single-handed and never exploited his tremendous influence in order to exert pressure. His prestige in the party was the prestige of intelligence and talent, knowledge and experience and high moral qualities. The atmosphere surrounding Lenin was an atmosphere of creative collective activity where everyone felt himself to be a comrade in arms and where the leader's presence did not stifle anyone's initiative and creative thought, but inspired everyone and roused them to independent quest. Lenin did not impose his arguments but proved and persuaded.

Lenin's name is dear and precious to working people throughout the world. His image is imprinted forever on the minds and hearts of millions as the image of the most energetic, wise fighter for working people's interests, infinitely devoted to the cause of the revolutionary restructuring of life and convinced of its correctness and inevitable triumph. "For more than 5 years I have been

reading the leader's books in fits and starts," Leningrad worker A. Tsvetkov writes to KOMMUNIST, "reading them, and finding in his style of writing the simplicity and accessibility of an artistic representation of reality and real truth. His books are accessible, comprehensible and interesting to any working class person who has passed through ten grades. I am sorry that many workers and even captains of production regard his works as literature for philosphers and scientists. That is not true. V. I. Lenin wrote in simple, accessible language precisely for the workers. When a person reads Lenin he cannot help thinking about all of mankind living on planet Earth, reflecting on problems and making comparisons with the past, the time of the people's storms and revolutions. He strives to look into the future. Anyone who sets himself the task of reading all V. I. Lenin's works will never grudge the time spent on this reading--on the contrary, he will learn to value every hour of his life. One day he will suddenly discover for himself that he has no more time for harmful pursuits and he will find that he desires knowledge in the sphere of other literature, knowledge of life on earth."

The charm of Lenin's personality lies in its harmonious nature, in his wonderful human qualities, his unfeigned modesty and sincere generosity. Politician and orator, theoretician and practical man, scientist and organizer, he was firm and unswerving in his defense of revolutionary principles, strict and exacting toward himself and others, attentive and concerned toward like-minded people, merciless toward ideological opponents. He was a type of leader of the masses, of the working people, without precedent in history, a new type of person--herald of the communist future.

May the name and cause of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin live through the ages!

CSO: 1802/14

OPENING ADDRESS AT IDEOLOGICAL SEMINAR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 14-18

[Opening address by M. A. Suslov, CC CPSU Politburo member and CC CPSU secretary, at the All-Union Seminar-Conference of Ideological Workers]

[Text] Noting that the seminar conference had been convoked on the decision of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade Suslov emphasized that the very fact of its convocation soon after the completion of the 26th CPSU Congress shows what an important role the party gives to political and educational work in implementing the tasks set by the congress.

To the stormy applause of those gathered, Comrade Suslov conveyed a warm greeting from Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev. Suslov noted that Comrade Brezhnev's steadfast attention to the activity of ideological cadres and the deep appreciation which he expressed from the congress rostrum to journalists, propagandists, directors, report presenters and agitators testifies to how highly the party values the selfless and difficult work of the many millions-strong ideological aktiv and to the high trust which it places in it.

Suslov continued: The 26th CPSU Congress became an outstanding event in the life of the party and the people. The accountability report of the CPSU Central Committee was welcomed by the party and the Soviet people as a great new contribution to the creative development of Marxism-Leninism, as a document of enormous political and theoretical significance in which all the vitally important problems of our time are comprehensively considered.

The congress, to use Lenin's words, "gave integral and systematically accurate replies to very important questions" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 24, p 79). The historical significance of the congress consists in the fact that it opened new horizons to the society of mature socialism. It showed the ways in which its possibilities can be used effectively for bringing fully into play the creative forces of the country's economic, scientific, technological and spiritual potential.

The congress put forward constructive new proposals aimed at strengthening peace, deepening detente and curbing the arms race. They constitute a direct continuation of our party's peace program.

The 26th congress showed convincingly that Lenin's party is confidently bearing the banner of communism, the banner of work and peace, and that the CPSU's general

course is one that aims to strengthen the country's economic might, the steadfast growth of the Soviet people's prosperity and culture, the insuring of peaceful conditions for their creative labor and the consolidation of the cardinal right of everybody in the world--the right to life.

The ideological front's prime task is intelligibly, vividly and convincingly to convey the ideas of the CPSU Central Committee's accountability report and the congress provisions to each and every communist and Komsomol member and all working people; to organize detailed study of them and to help party organizations direct the masses' energy and initiative to successfully implement the decisions of the congress. The conference will also discuss how to carry out this work in the best and most efficient manner possible.

The 26th CPSU Congress, Comrade Suslov emphasized, was held in the exceptionally efficient environment set by the accountability report. Its work was characterized by a high degree of exactingnessin its approach to the questions under discussion, by realistic assessments, by a principled and courageous exposure of shortcomings and by the finding of ways and means to overcome them.

The exacting, critical and constructive spirit of the congress should determine the content and style of the entire organizational and ideological work among the masses. To affirm this spirit of Bolshevik adherence to principle and creative activity in the life of each collective, to inculcate an implacable attitude to shortcomings and intolerance toward any deviations from our way of life and our morality--it is of this that the real contribution of ideological workers consists when resolving economic, social and all other questions posed by the congress.

Propaganda is called upon to actively facilitate the fullest possib'e release of the Soviet people's creative forces, significantly improving the efficiency of their creative labor and insuring unconditional fulfillment of the tasks of the 11th Five-Year Plan.

The party proceeds from the fact that efficient ideological activity is inconceivable without comprehensively taking into consideration the realities of the sociopolitical and spiritual life of our society, the increased level of education and culture of the Soviet people, the accumulated experience of the party's political and educational work.

The sharpening of the ideological struggle in the international arena should also be fully taken into account. Our class enemies are operating still more brazenly and craftily. By showering slander and appealing to all kinds of prejudices left in people's minds and by maliciously interpreting the shortcomings, neglect and difficulties in our life, the enemies are trying to erode class consciousness and belief in our ideals. It would be wrong to ignore the effect of alien ideology on the consciousness of a section of the people. We must be uncompromising in the struggle of ideals, actively expose anti-Sovietism and anticommunism and come out resolutely against any echoes of alien opinions.

The present state of ideological and party educational work was profoundly and critically examined at the congress. The congress pointed out that the basic tasks

facing party organizations here are set out in the CPSU Central Committee's resolution of 26 April 1979, which, as was noted in the review report, is of a long-term nature. It constitutes an extensive program of the party's ideological and educational work.

The implementation of the CPSU Central Committee resolution and the resolutions of the 26th congress require constant perfection of party organizations and, as stated in the accountability report, the restructuring of many sectors and spheres of ideological work.

The main thing which invariably draws the party's attention is the consistent strengthening of the link between propaganda and life and the increasing of its effectiveness and topicality. In revealing the point of this demand, Comrade Brezhnev said at the congress: "...It is a matter of achieving in practice the unity of the party's ideological-theoretical, political, educational, organizational and economic work."

In this unity and inseparability of word and deed, when the word conforms with the deed, and the deed with the word, lies the basis of the success of our propaganda, and not only propaganda but all party work. Here lies the source of the authority of party organizations, the basis of the effectiveness of work among the masses of the people. It is, in fact, a question of the further broadening of the party's ties with the millions of working masses. But where it concerns millions of people, that is where--as Vladimir Il'ich Lenin said--begins for communists the most serious politics and runs the main line of organizational, political and educational work.

Life reaffirms that infringement on the unity of word and deed and the replacement of real acts by political twaddle has a harmful effect on people's attitudes, on the moral atmosphere of work collectives and on society as a whole. The gap between word and deed, intolerable everywhere, becomes especially dangerous when it is expressed in a weakening of control over labor and consumption measures. Such a weakening might bring to naught any educational and propaganda efforts.

It is especially important to take into account Lenin's demands for the "strictest control by society and by the state over the extent of labor and consumption" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 33, p 97) when resolving questions of labor incentive and improving distribution. "The main criterion in distribution under socialism," Comrade Brezhnev said at the 26th congress, "can only be labor--its quantity and quality. Unfortunately, it is not always like that in practice. All kinds of wage-leveling, instances of extra payments essentially for merely coming to work and not for its true results, and the distribution of unmerited prizes have an extremely harmful effect on production indices and on people's mentality."

Here we are faced primarily with a specific task: to establish everywhere the prestige of honest, conscientious and creative work. This is one of the most important conditions of success in the struggle against attitudes of comsumerism, recidivist narrowmindedness, and petty-bourgeois psychology. The shaping of the new man and his ideological training are a complete affirmation of the norms and principles of the socialist way of life and are predetermined by the need for a skillful and precise selection of all that is new and advanced, which should be

maintained and developed and the need for a presistent and consistent struggle against whatever is trying to stop our advancement. Only thus can we achieve a situation where agitation is carried out efficiently, and that is the most convincing form of our agitation.

Theoretical work, M. A. Suslov stressed, has always occupied and occupies now a very important place in the party's ideological activities. Among the great achievements in this sphere, the congress particularly singled out the drafting of the concept of developed socialism. The party is determining the long-term tasks, and is drafting its strategy and tactics on its basis. The materials of the congress provide new stimuli for further development of reasearch in the field of philosophy, political economy and scientific communism, and in all spheres of social sciences.

These studies will be the more fruitful and productive the more resolutely and energetically our social sciences are freed of elements of scholasticism and dogmatism. Improvement of interaction between theoretical thought and the practice of communist education is gaining especial importance in this sphere. Science is called upon to assist actively in educational work, to equip our ideological cadres with clear-cut, well-founded recommendations, including in such an important sphere molding the younger generation as public education.

Equipping the Soviet man with knowledge of the laws of social development and a clear understanding of the party's policies and inculcating the aspiration and ability to build communism has been and remains the heart of the whole of our ideological work. Without doubt, a significant place must be occupied here by party education and economic education. We have examples of the creative organization of this work, and they were mentioned at the congress. But we are not by any means satisfied with everything in party education today.

Many party committees put up with the state of affairs when this education is poorly linked to the resolution of urgent socioeconomic problems. Manifestations of formalism and scholasticism have not been eradicated; the lively exchange of opinions and creative discussions are often absent from lectures. Instead of making a profound analysis of vital issues and acute problems of concern to the participants, they sometimes restrict themselves to a mechanical repetition of known theses. This can be explained to a significant extent by the lack of well-trained propaganda cadres and inadequate work with propagandists.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev spoke at the congress about the main thing in party education, about its end result, about the fact that people should learn, in a Leninist way, "to act as communism really demands" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 41, p 302). We should be thinking at this seminar conference about how to implement this very important aim, how to eradicate formalism and scholasticism, and about which forms and methods of party education to introduce in practice.

The party and the Central Committee attach enormous importance to the work of the press, television and radio, which determine to a large extent the content of the whole of society's ideological life.

It must be said that, following the adoption of the CPSU Central Committee resolution of 26 April 1979, the party committees and communists of editorial

offices made quite an effort to improve affairs. They began giving more detailed treatment to the issues of the economy, socialist competition, the introduction of progressive experience and achievements of scientific and technological progress. The specificity of criticism is linked, as a rule, with the organization of the struggle to correct mistakes and overcome shortcomings. More attention is being devoted by the press to issues of inner party life and moral education; the tone in this serious and very important work is set by PRAVDA, our party's central organ.

However, we must still do quite a lot of work to insure that issues of newspapers and magazines are full of pithy articles and involve people in serious analysis and generalization of the facts. It is also necessary to make fuller use of the truly enormous possibilities of our television.

We must struggle persistently to enhance the effectiveness of both critical and positival material, including that connected with the propagation of progressive experience. Much depends here upon the ability of party committees to make correct use of the potential of their press organs, television and radio and to support their initiatives. And of course one must give short shrift to those who ignore the just pronouncements of the press and who will not tolerate criticism.

The Central Committee, and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev personally, present an example of an attentive attitude to the press, supporting as they do principled and important critical articles.

A major role belongs to Soviet literature and arts, which carry a powerful ideological and moral potential and possess enormous force of emotional influence in ideological and political education work. In the conditions of the ideological struggle, which has become more acute, the creative unions and editorial offices, Comrade Suslov noted, should be extremely mindful of issues of world outlook, the ideological commitment of the arts and their party and popular spirit. Their primary duty is to assist artists in being active participants in communist construction, defending progressive, humanistic party ideals with their creative work.

The success of anything, as we know, is decided in the final analysis by the cadres. What should a worker on the ideological front be like? He is a man of profound knowledge, of great culture of spirit, able to listen, understand and convince people. Putting it in Lenin's words, "Every party worker must learn to make a conscious choice of means, manner and methods of struggle which are capable of giving the greatest and firmest results with least effort" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 9, p 208).

These are high demands. But they are determined by the nature of the contemporary stage and strategic aims of communist construction. In a word, we must set out for new horizons in our everyday political, organizational and educational work.

In conclusion, Suslov said that all of the party's thoughts and plans, all of its work have as their highest aim the people's well-being and upward progress to communism. The Soviet people ardently approve the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress, and in them see inspiring prospects for the country's development. At

the moment, it is particularly important to have every person, every worker, profoundly understand the close ties between his vital interests and the realization of the congress decisions, and to have a clear idea of what he personally can and should do in order to implement them. All the political, organizational and educational work of the party committees and all our party propaganda should be aimed at this.

CSO: 1802/14

UNIVERSAL-HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE OF THE WORKERS MOVEMENT: RESULTS AND PROBLEMS OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 19-30

[Text] The 26th congress of the Leninist party, an important milestone in the advance of the peoples of our country toward communism, became a noteworthy landmark in the development of the world workers movement and its communist vanguard and in the strengthening of the positions of all revolutionary and progressive forces. In this respect, the analysis and evaluation of the sociopolitical role of the working clas as one which is in the center of the contemporary epoch, provided in the congress' materials, the CC CPSU accountability report above all, is one of its most outstanding features. The congress thus provided yet another convincing proof that our party builds its activities on the profound scientific understanding of the laws governing world social developments and of the entire set of topical problems of the class confrontation in the international arena.

The works and speeches of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, in which Marxist-Leninist theory is developed according to the contemporary stage of social life, provide a powerful impetus for the profound and comprehensive study of such problems. The documents of our party congresses and the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and other party leaders are valuable both from the methodological viewpoint and the precise and scientifically argumented characteristics of the most important landmarks and events in the development of the proletarian liberation struggle. They are instructive also as a model for the consistent, uncompromising and convincing criticism of bourgeois, social-reformist, right-wing opportunist and left-wing revisionist concepts. These works clearly define the most important features of the revolutionary changes which are growing irrepressibly on a global scale and underscore with complete justification the profound and comprehensive scientific interpretation of them. "Flight of the mind and tireless search for the new," for which Comrade L. I. Brezhnev appeals, are the necessary prerequisites for the successful solution of this important problem.

This has drawn the attention of many Soviet researchers whose work is guided by the coordinating Scientific Council on the Comprehensive Problem of "History of the International Workers and National Liberation Movements," which operates under the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, Social Sciences Section. This work involves the participation of collectives of scientific institutions and higher educational establishments of the CC CPSU (Institute of Marxism-Leninism, Academy

of Social Sciences and Institute of Social Sciences), several USSR Academy of Sciences humanities institutes (Institute of World Economics and International Relations, Institute of General History, Institute of Oriental Studies, Institute of Slavic and Balkan Studies, Africa Institute, Latin America Institute and others), and the chairs of modern and recent modern history of many universities throughout the country. The USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement, which was created 15 years ago, is purposefully working on this problem.

Obviously, we must immediately point out most specifically that this entire extensive and varied work, in terms of specific topics and scientific methods, is oriented toward the profound study of the theoretical foundations of the modern social sciences and is closely linked with the living practice of building a new society, the struggle for the revolutionary reorganization of the world and the actual needs of social development.

"His majesty the working class" is today the main character in the great worldwide accomplishments which are radically changing the economic and sociopolitical aspect and spiritual climate of the planet. This applies to the hundreds of millions of working people through whose efforts all of contemporary civilization is being created. The working class is the creator of the material and spiritual goods without which mankind could not exist. It is the basic production force of society. It is the army of working people who are fighting for the liberation of all those oppressed by the burden of capitalist exploitation and who are successfully implementing in the reality of socialism the ideals fo.mulated and substantiated through the genius of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

In penetrating the "secrets" of social development and in studying all possible "cross sections" of development of the international proletariat and of its confrontation with the bourgeoisie and the laws which govern the steadfast enhancement of its social role, Marxist-Leninist science sums up the tremendous historical experience acquired by the working class. It makes it possible to define the most likely directions of the future development of social antagonisms and to anticipate the new class battles. Consequently, it performs quite essential cognitive and practical functions. The successes of this science and the results it obtains help to develop the programs for the communist and workers movements.

In reconstructing in its completeness the picture of the rise of the universal proletariat as a revolutionary force, historical-materialistic thinking becomes its ideological weapon and means for revolutionary upbringing and education. The importance of this ideological weapon has been repeatedly emphasized by the founders of scientific communism. They urgently recommended that "the workers in a given country be always informed of the progress of their class in all other countries..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 16, p 14), for success in the cause of the workers can be achieved only when the organized proletarian mass "is guided by knowledge" (Ibid., p 10). "To the conscientious workers," Lenin wrote, "there is no more important task than that of being familiar with the dynamics of its class, its nature, its objectives and its tasks, and its conditions and practical forms" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 25, p 244).

As a result of its achievements, which were noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, the science of the working class is rising to the position of one of the leading, the "shock" directions of Soviet social sciences. In the past 10 to 15 years truly remarkable positive changes have taken place in this area. In the 10th Five-Year Plan more than 1,000 works were published on the history and the contemporary problems of the international proletariat. In recent years, printed organs such as the journal RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR, the yearbook "Rabochiy Klass v Mirovom Revolyutsionnom Protsesse" [The Working Class in the World Revolutionary Process] (published by the commission on multilateral cooperation among academies of sciences of the socialist countries, which bears the same name), the reference manual "Mezhdunarodnoye Rabocheye Dvizheniye" [The International Workers Movement] (IMRD)(USSR Academy of Sciences), the systematic publications "Sorevnovaniye Dvukh Sistem" [Competition Between the Two Systems] (USSR Academy of Sciences), "Mezhdunarodnoye Kommunisticheskoye Dvizheniye" [The International Communist Movement] (CC CPSU Institute of Social Sciences) and others have earned the deserved recognition of the broad reading circles in recent years. Works by Soviet scientists in this area have been positively rated and acknowledged by the progressive circles of the works' scientific public. This was proved beyond doubt at the International Forum of Researchers on the Working Class and the Workers Movement, which was held 1 year ago in Paris (see KOMMUNIST No 13, 1980, pp 68-78). It was equally confirmed by the results of the latest (August 1979) 11th World Congress of the International Association for Political Sciences, reflected in the recently published book "Lenin kak Politicheskiy Myslitel" [Lenin as a Political Philosopher] (Politizdat, Moscow, 1981).

The very boundaries of scientific research in this area have changed: today they encompass areas in the history of the workers movement previously ignored by Marxist thinking; the researchers are now looking at new countries and areas. This particularly applies to the young proletariat of the Afro-Asian states.

The organic synthesis of results achieved by various sciences is inherent in the best achievements of Marxist scientists. The high theoretical level of such works is achieved by combining an analytical approach to a tremendous amount of empirical data with profound and thoroughly substantiated summations of phenomena and processes in the class struggle of the proletariat and the close attention paid to problems of the methodology and historiography of the science of the working class itself. This combination of historical-event and problem-theoretical research is determining in the definitive multiple-volume work "Mezhdunarodnoye Rabocheye Dvizheniye. Voprosy Istorii i Teorii" [The International Workers Movement. Problems of History and Theory] (Academician B. N. Ponomorev, chairman of the chief editorial commission), which included the participation of a big collective of Soviet scientists; the fourth volume of this work is now out (see KOMMUNIST No 10, 1976; No 14, 1977; No 1, 1979; and No 3, 1981). This work, which is the first in world history literature to recreate an overall picture of the development of the class struggle of the proletariat, became an event in Marxist social sciences. The fact that it relied on the firm and broad base of monographs on the international workers movement made its publication possible.

This work offers a most complete and full theoretical elaboration of the problems of the establishment and growth of the working class, which is of essential significance.

The founders of scientific communism emphasize that "The proletariat goes through different developmental stages" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 4, p 431). As a class it is established, to use Lenin's expression, "in the course of struggle and development" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 40, p 310). That is why in the study of processes characterizing its current social aspect and developmental trends, the Soviet researchers strictly follow the basic requirement of the Marxist-Leninist approach to the study of social life: the stipulation of historicism. The intensified development of individual stages in the formation of the working class has not only added new features to the picture which was created by previous works but, far more importantly, has substantively expressed the historical prerequisites and means for the appearance of the proletariat and defined the main stages of its social growth, its comprehensive development which took place over time, starting with the time of factory output, followed by the industrial revolution which began at the end of the 18th century, to the present.

The all-substantiated specific studies and theoretically integral Marxist-Leninist concept of the historical development of the working class are among the major cognitive and politically topical achievements of Soviet science. The different detachments of the international proletariat in the different levels of their historical development represent the past and the present. That is why the clear and scientifically substantiated understanding of their class commonality, dictated by the universal-historical mission of the elimination of capitalism and the building of a classless society, is the theoretical key to the policy of unity of the international working class and of each and every one of its detachments and of the international unity of the tasks in the struggle for the achievement of its historical objectives. Its is precisely within the framework of this universal-historical commonality that sometimes essentially different specific features and specific assignments facing the individual detachments of the international working class can find their only true position.

It is not surprising that, in this connection, the study of the working class of the socialist society, of the Soviet working class in the first place, is particularly important. It is precisely here, in this area of research, that it becomes possible not only to summarize the socialist development of the working class, i.e., the highest form of activity it has reached, but to bring up the "growing points" which enable us to understand future global prospects through data which different countries possess already today.

As the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress noted, "In our country the working class became not merely the most numerous class but accounts for the majority of the working people as well." Today the country has about 80 million workers--two thirds of the employed population. The leading role of the working class in social life is rising steadily. Its ideological-political maturity, education, professional skills, well-being and spiritual standards are growing. All of these changes demanded and still require a serious scientific analysis of the historically based changes in the numerical and social structure, status, and educational-technical and general cultural standards of the Soviet working class, not only in past historical stages but most of all in the stage of the developed socialist society. The study of the set of problems related to the social growth of the working class is of essential importance in clarifying the

theoretical stipulation of the 26th CPSU Congress to the effect that the establishment of the class structure in Soviet society "will take place in its essential and main features within the historical framework of mature socialism." The contemporary working class was and remains the guiding force of this process. Its revolutionary ideology and morality, collectivistic mentality, interests and ideals are now shared by all population strata in the country. We must continue our unabated efforts to insure the all-round study of the Soviet working class. This enhances the significance of the scientific study of phenomena pertaining not to the working class as a whole alone but to its individual groups, taking into account their characteristics and interests, and the development of problems such as the equalization of social disparities which outstrip the framework of individual classes. Problems of the development of the working class are also a leading component of the comprehensive problem of improving the Soviet way of life and completing the reorganization on a collectivistic basis of all social relations and of the molding of the new man. They are inseparably linked to problems of the further improvement of the Soviet political system and the expansion of the role of the communist party and the mass organizations of working people in the life of society. Only initial steps have been taken by the scientists in describing the historical example of the constructive activities and direct international relations with which the Soviet working class carries out its great international mission. As a whole, all these problems are subsumed in the tasks considered by the 26th CPSU Congress as fundamental in the social sciences.

A new type of research on problems of the working class under socialism--joint works by scientists from the socialist countries--has been developing in recent years. This makes the extensive sharing of experience acquired in the development of the working class in one or another fraternal country possible. The fruitfulness of this practice is confirmed, in particular, by the activities of the research group on "The Working Class in the Socialist Countries," which is part of the Problem Commission on "The Working Class in the World's Revolutionary Process."

In the course of the building of socialism the peoples within the world socialist comity gained varied experience in the organization of the production process, management and the solution of national economic problems. In Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's view what they have accomplished in this area represents "an entire epoch." In his appeal "to study attentively and make wider use of the experience of the fraternal countries," he also noted at the 26th CPSU Congress that it would be erroneous to paint the picture of the contemporary socialist world in festive colors only. "A conversion to intensive economic development, the implementation of major social programs and the shaping of a communist awareness," he said, "are not accomplished immediately. It requires time and tireless creative searches."

This statement, made from the rostrum of the party forum, asserts the need for the Soviet social scientists to engage in a deeper, more comprehensive and more realistic interpretation of the problems of the development of the working class in the socialist countries. It is the direct obligation of our scientists to master the social factors and the entire dialectical complexity of socialist development.

The problems of the social dynamics of the proletariat of the capitalist countries under the conditions of state monopoly capital and the contemporary scientific and

technical revolution is a difficult and responsible area of the Marxist-Leninist science of the working class. For a number of years fierce arguments on this problem have been taking place between Marxists and their ideological opponents. The scientific servants of the bourgeoisie are tirelessly insinuating to one and all their version of "the disappearance" of the working class, hastening to say "farewell" to the proletariat. The Soviet scientists have done a great deal to interpret the true changes which are taking place within the working class under contemporary capitalist conditions. The monographs prepared by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement and by other scientific institutions in the country have convincingly demonstrated the trend of a stable growth of the working class and its increased share of the population; they have clarified the social sources for its reinforcement and brought up new factors which characterize its social appearance and which are related to the intellectualization of industrial labor and the industrialization of managerial labor, the increased strength and significance of the engineering and trade-office proletariat, and the rapprochement between the social status of the mass categories of employees and industrial workers. Unlike the vulgarized concepts of bourgeois sociologists on the "deproletarization" of contemporary society, on the basis of tremendous factual and theoretical data the Soviet scientists have revealed the true nature of the actual historical upsurge of the working class.

The study of the negative consequences of the scientific and technical revolution on the situation of the working people has been the subject of many books by philosophers, political economists, historians and sociologists. However, it is relatively recently that our social scientists undertook the theoretical summation of the main line of its social action--its influence on the accelerated development of the working class as the main productive and revolutionary force called upon and able to carry out great liberation assignments.

The scientific and technical revolution was manifested in the radical reorganization of the technological and organizational forms of activity of hundreds of millions of hired workers. It greatly changed the very content of labor and the attitude of the working people toward it. The engineering organization and mass assembly line production made the work of these people incomparably more productive. They enabled the best organized detachments of the working class to mount a successful struggle against the archaic forms of exploitation which are being restored today by the monopolies under the circumstances of mass chronic unemployment and mass "clandestine" hiring. It is hardly necessary to demonstrate the significance which the struggle against the contemporary system of capitalist exploitation, including exploitation in the realm of spiritual production, has in terms of the fate of the working people. The all-round study of the system of largely concealed exploitation of complex and highly skilled manpower (not to mention the processes for its development), which appeared in the course of the scientific and technical revolution, is a quite urgent and far from accomplished duty of Marxist researchers.

The maneuvers of the experienced bourgeoisie are aimed at hindering in all possible ways the tremendous process of the sociopolitical growth of the working class which is taking place on the basis of natural historical laws. This makes even more responsible the task of Marxist-Leninist research on the growing antagonism between the role of the working class as the main productive and social force and its status as an oppressed and exploited class within the political and

economic structures of the bourgeois society, i.e., on the antagonism which is the axis of social contradictions within capitalism.

This problem is inseparably related also to the solution of a number of specific problems. They include, first of all, the definition of the social boundaries of the contemporary working class. Today a number of historical and sociological studies show how the members of this oppressed class are assuming an ever greater share of predominately mental functions, including operations directly related to spiritual production, along with the development of the scientific and technical revolution. Familiarity with this process makes it possible to determine the basis on which the material interests of workers, rank and file employees and the engineering and technical intelligentsia can be brought closer to each other and to determine the specific content of the common slogan of struggle for an anti-imperialist alliance between workers engaged in physical and mental labor, formulated by the communist movement, the dialectics of involving different detachments of hired labor in the class struggle and the revolutionary movement, and the laws governing the broadening of the movement's social foundations.

The influence of the working class on the course of the scientific and technical revolution under capitalism merits serious attention. Bourgeois science frequently depicts the proletariat (or what, in its view, "remains" of the proletariat in our age) as a semiliterate mass of backward and impoverished people, engaged in physical labor almost exclusively, frightened by technological progress and opposing automation. This is a thorough distortion of the main feature, the objective role of the working class and of its labor and struggle in their capacity as the main factors for the development of societal production forces. Marxist-Leninist science proved that it is precisely the working class which, as it demands higher wages and, therefore, the development of big consumer markets, higher production standards and the elimination of the most blatant forms of exploitation, and improvement in the living standards of the families of working people, youth education and so on, periodically opens new channels for the application of the engineering organization of labor and mass production technology. It is entirely the working class and not the bourgeoisie which is defending today the basic interests governing the development of the entire society and progress in industry and culture.

The realization by the struggling masses of this basic stipulation formulated by Marxist social science is the most important prerequisite for the consolidation of the working class and for the unification around it of all progressive and democratic forces. The socioeconomic and political programs of the struggle waged by a number of mass workers' organizations are already adopting the slogan of supporting the most important progressive processes of the scientific and technical revolution. The scientific elaboration of this problem (which is taking place purposefully, as the recently published study "Sotsial'no Ekonomicheskiye Problemy Bor'by Kommunisticheskikh Partiy v Razvitykh Kapitalisticheskikh Stranakh" [Socioeconomic Problems of the Struggle Waged by the Communist Parties in the Developed Capitalist Countries], Nauka, Moscow, 1981 confirms) may prove to be of tremendous practical significance.

In the 1980s the struggle against the arms race, the militarization of industry and society, the growing danger of a military-technical deformation of the

capitalist scientific and technical revolution and the growth of a purely military form of state-monopoly capitalism will become the linchpin of such program. What are the hardships which the militaristic method for the "solution" of the unemployment problem brings to the toiling masses? What are the constructive measures for the adoption of the large-scale and effective democratic alternative of developing nonmilitary production which would take into consideration the laws governing the operation of the capitalist marketplace economy? It is only by their efforts to resolve such problems, in the course of the struggle against the threat of war, that the democratic forces can undermine the process of the further expansion of the multinational military-industrial complexes in the United States and Western Europe and the establishment of such a complex in Japan. However, in order to formulate such an alternative, science must look ahead and study the way of life of the working people and the material and spiritual output of the industrialized capitalist countries.

This requirement becomes even more important in the study of the processes governing the establishment of a working class in the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. A great deal has been accomplished in this respect in recent years. The Soviet scientists undertook the study of new detachments of the proletariat growing under conditions complicated by the socioeconomic backwardness which was inherited by the liberated countries from colonial times and mainly as a result of neocolonialism. The interpretation of the role of the working class in the national liberation processes is a particularly important problem. It offers extensive scope for research, from the significance of the methods of proletarian struggle and of the schools of proletarian internationalism through the destinies of the liberation movement to the role which a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party must play under such circumstances.

Naturally, researchers must do a great deal more work to fill some gaps in the study of the appearance and development of the proletariat. Creative work on the sociopsychological aspects of the development of the personality of the contemporary worker would also greatly contribute to the further concretizing of the Marxist-Leninist concept of the working class. As a whole, following the scientific works written by Soviet scientists, the outlines of a truly gigantic panoramic view are becoming apparent, spread over the destinies of many generations of workers on earth, from the breakdown of feudalism to the general crisis of capitalism and the transition of mankind to socialism and communism.

In the period since the 25th party congress Soviet science of the working class was enriched by the major studies of the class struggle of the proletariat in the broad meaning of the concept, covering all historical periods and all main foreshortenings of this struggle. In this connection, interpreting the activities of trade unions and the role of the various organizations of working people in rebuffing the intensifying onslaught of the monopolies, especially the multinational corporations, and of the leading currents in the contemporary worldwide workers and trade union movements became particularly topical. The numerous aspects, particularly socioeconomic, of strikes in the capitalist countries became topics of close study. Various studies proved that the strike, which is one of the most effective defenses on the part of the working class and its allies against the pressure of capital, is acquiring an ever greater antimonopoly content. Such

studies sum up the main parameters of proletarian strikes over long periods of time. For the first time in world literature substantial standardized information has been compiled for scientifically accurate computer processing. Such fundamental works ("Stachka: Istoriya i Sovremmennost'" [The Strike: History and Modern Times], Nauka, Moscow, 1978; "Zabastovochnaya Bor'ba Trudyashchikhsya. Konets XIX v.-70-ye Gody XX v. (Statistika)" [Working People's Strikes Between the End of the 19th Century and the 1970s (Statistics)]. Nauka, Moscow, 1980) bring up the theoretical and specific-historical aspects of the phenomenon of the strike itself as a specific form of struggle and of proletarian organization. They show the characteristics and trends of strikes today, which break out not only for the sake of meeting the immediate demands of the working people, which have reached a new level under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution, but also for democracy and against monopolistic omnipotence in general.

Nevertheless, it is precisely in the area of the study of the mass workers movement and mass workers organizations that the researchers still face many complex problems ranging from the study of the practice of particularly influential and frequently sectorial trade unions to the experience of workers attempts to interfere in production management. We shall limit ourselves to a single although essentially important example. The problems of the relationship between trade unions and political parties, which faced labor theoreticians and practical workers about a century ago and which, since then, have been given a variety of interpretations (suffice it to recall anarcho-syndicalism with its rejection of the party-political leadership of the trade unions), which have regained their current topical nature. Differently oriented trade unions still exist, some of which recognize the leading role of the revolutionary parties of the working class; those which, while proclaiming the political autonomy of trade union organizations, in fact follow the fairway of social-reformist and even bourgeois political parties; and finally, trade unions which stubbornly reject any connection with any political association of the working people. Marxist-Leninist social science faces the important task of providing scientific assistance in the solution of such problems.

As in the past, the Soviet scientists engaged in the study of the proletariat's class struggle, its history and current problems are particularly interested in the momentous events which constitute the qualitative milestones of revolutions, which are the proletariat's historical actions. Intensive work has been done on the history of the first proletarian revolution--the Paris Commune. The 1905-1907 Russian Revolution, the first revolution of the imperialist epoch, which opened the era of revolutionary battles of the 20th century, has been studied very closely.

The study of the turning point in world history--the Great October Socialist Revolution which, in the words of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, opened the way "to the creation of a new type of civilization on earth"--was expanded. Many specific historical and political-theoretical aspects of the indivisible ties linking the revolutionary lessons of 1917 with the entire subsequent struggle against the exploiting system were established through the collective efforts of the Soviet scientists. The world's revolutionary workers movement, which developed under the banner of the ideas of the October Revolution, achieved major successes and, as

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, "The international working class and its political vanguard--the communist and workers parties--approached the 1980s with confidence. This required a major and comprehensive upsurge and the crossing of difficult development stages."

Unquestionably, work on the history of the international workers movement on a higher scientific level, including its earlier stages, is one of the achievements of the Soviet social sciences. As a result of these efforts we are now far better acquainted and more extensively familiar with the past history of the proletariat, the changes within it, its heroic "battles on the way," its successes and failures, the reasons for both, and the growth of the working class as a revolutionary force and the complexities and contradictions within this process.

The study of the Paris Commune, whose 110th anniversary was celebrated last March, is an example of the topical nature of the results of historical research. The works by Soviet scientists helped us to see the historical foundations and legitimate nature of the first revolutionary pressure of the proletariat on capitalism clearly and to their fullest extent; they helped us to realize the close intertwining of elements of spontaneous development with the embryos of proletarian organization as shown in this onslaught, and the birth of a real class awareness among those who attacked the bastions of "financial feudalism" in the hope of putting an end to the exploitation of man by man. They help us to see the profound sources of the strength, weaknesses, successes and errors of the first workers government, rooted in a specific social base. Here is another example: our knowledge of the British factory workers in that distant period--the first half of the 18th century, on the eve of the industrial upheaval, whose offspring was the factory proletariat--became greatly enriched. A study of this topic, made by the modern and most modern history chair of Moscow State University, profoundly clarified the economic and foreign economic prerequisites, thoroughly revealed the way through which this then new social class was established and depicted the social variety of the then specialized manual workers and differences in their living conditions and status in industry. It shed light on the methods they used to oppose capitalist exploitation. It would be a great mistake to believe that this topic could be of interest to specialists only. For example, the thorough study of the experience of the distant past is the foundation for the more accurate and deeper understanding of current processes in the development of the proletariat in the developing countries.

The past, whether distant or recent, contains the tremendous historical experience of the working class. Since all the stages in its development and links of its struggle are inseparably intertwined, it is natural that the thorough interpretation of any historical stage in the development of the class confrontation between the proletariat and the oppressors, based on specific data, takes us to our present reality and contributes to our understanding of many aspects of its activities today.

The history and the contemporary development of the class struggle of the proletariat on the political level, the history of the world communist movement above all, which has now become a powerful force in international life, are among the most important research topics. The sources of this history are related to

Lenin's name, the establishment of communist parties in many regions and countries in the world, ranging from Japan to Latin America, to their role in the struggle against fascism and reaction in the 1920s and 1930s, the history of the Communist International and its affiliated organizations--the Trade Union International and the Youth International--and, finally, the activities of outstanding revolutionaries of our time such as Liebknecht, Luxemburg, Gramsci and Dimitrov. They were comprehensively studied and interpreted in a number of books published between 1976 and 1980. The assertion of the historical significance of the ideological and political legacy of the Comintern and the international nature of the Leninist principles of the international communist movement are the main themes of works on this topic.

In summing up the historical experience of the proletarian vanguard, they support the communists in their current practical work. Essentially, it is frequently a question of an historical projection of the vital problems of today's communist movement. A properly understood history of previous stages constitutes a major contribution not only to historiography but to the study of the theoretical and political aspects of our time.

Such studies are an inseparable part of the major scientific work which focuses on the topic of proletarian internationalism as one of the basic, the essential principles of the international workers movement. The task is to depict proletarian internationalism as an integral ideology, a policy, a system of moral foundations of the working class, and to show the mechanism of action of proletarian internationalism in the policy of communist and workers parties and in the class struggle waged by the international proletariat as a whole.

Naturally, the center of gravity of such research is always found on the level of the study of the various activities of the communist parties today. Substantive works were published within the period under consideration, describing its practical and theoretical sides, the work of communists in the capitalist countries among the masses and the mass organizations and the various toiling strata, and their struggle for social progress, peace and the national independence of the nations. Problems of unity have begun to be posed in their entire complexity and on the basis of historical experience. We must also note, however, that as a whole, the contemporary international communist movement has still not been sufficiently studied. The solution of the problems formulated by the 26th CPSU Congress for the social sciences calls for the energizing of the efforts of Soviet scientists in this direction.

The correlation between the revolutionary process and the struggle for international peace and against the threat of war holds a special position among the theoretical-political problems of the contemporary workers movement. In their works the Soviet scientists convincingly substantiate the position of the workers movement on such matters, including its economic, social, ideological and political aspects. The substantiated clarification of the dialectical interconnection among peace, disarmament and social progress (in socialist, capitalist and developing countries) is the unquestionable merit of the researchers working in this area. The work created through the joint efforts of scientists from the socialist comity, dealing with the fate of the European continent--the homeland of the

workers and communist movements ("Za Yevropu Mira i Progressa. Kommunisty--Novaya Obstanovka v Yevrope. Problemy Ideyno-Politicheskoy Bor'by" [For a Europe of Peace and Progress. The Communists--The New Situation in Europe. Problems of Ideological-Political Struggle], Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1977) plays a significant role in the study of such problems.

Closely related to this range of problems is the study of the very topical problems of the social democratic movement. Its complex history, ideology and politics and the conflicting trends in its current development have become the subject of the very close attention of Soviet researchers. The critical and realistic approach to such problems, with their entire disparity, is dictated largely by the need for cooperation among all democratic forces in the struggle for the prevention of war and strengthening the peace, the importance of which was emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress.

The social democratic movement, which plays a major role in international politics, is an influential force mainly in the labor movement within the citadels of imperialism. However, it is adamantly trying to extend its sphere of influence over the proletariat of the developing countries as well. All this makes the topics related to the study of the social democratic movement particularly important from the viewpoint of determining the possibilities of strengthening the unity of the workers movement and of engaging in a principled ideological debate with social reformism (an example of such a substantiated analysis is found in the monograph "Sotsial-Demokraticheskiy i Burzhuaznyy Reformizm v Sisteme Gosudarstvennogo-Monopolisticheskogo Kapitalizma" [Social-Democratic and Bourgeois Reformism Within the System of State-Monopoly Capitalism], Nauka, Moscow, 1980).

The ideological confrontation, which has become aggravated today, makes it incumbent upon the Marxists-Leninists to know their ideological opponents. The need for an active rebuff of anticommunism was strongly reemphasized in the documents of the 26th CPSU Congress.

The meaningful criticism of contemporary bourgeois, social reformist and left-wing extremist concepts which oppose, directly or indirectly, the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolutionary-liberation mission of the proletariat is the result of the work of many Soviet scientists. They proved in their publications that the contemporary ideological struggle is essentially focused on the problems of the working class and the workers movement. A number of works give a comprehensive substantiation of this thesis (see, for example, the monograph "Rabochiy Klass v Tsentre Ideyno-Teoreticheskogo Protivoborstva" [The Working Class in the Center of the Ideological-Theoretical Confrontation], Nauka, Moscow, 1979), which provide a substantiated rebuff to those who are trying to prove the "obsolescence" of Marxism-Leninism and its "inapplicability" to the study of the contemporary epoch. They expose Maoism which pits itself against the global revolutionary movement as well as the groundlessness of the excessive exaggeration of the specifics of the labor movement in one or another country to the detriment of its general laws and the reformulation of the old petty opportunistic ideas of "national exclusivity."

Soviet science on the working class and the world's workers movement came to the 26th CPSU Congress with significant achievements. The CC CPSU accountability report to the congress notes that party documents and scientific studies of recent

years consider the various aspects of mature socialism and that works were written showing the laws of the global revolutionary process. Good studies have been made of the history of the international workers movement, the current stage of the general crisis in the capitalist system and the development of state-monopoly capitalism.

It is entirely clear that these trends in social science research are inseparably interlinked. Such links are of essential importance to the scientists studying the labor movement. It is precisely the working class, acting both directly and indirectly, that is the determining factor in each of the three basic currents of today's global revolutionary process. The social development of the working class is the foundation for the establishment of a communist system and the mainspring for the development of contradictions within contemporary capitalism. This is confirmed by the historical changes which are taking place today in all areas of social life and which offer ever new confirmation of the insurmountable vital strength of Marxism-Leninism, the single international doctrine of the working class. Despite all the efforts of its adversaries, Leninism is confidently asserting itself as the theory and practice of the workers movement and the entire revolutionary development in our age, as the master of the mind and the peak of social thinking.

At the same time, the study of the working class and the workers movement in all their aspects can be conducted only on the basis of the laws governing social development and of its main line--the global revolutionary process--with a constant and accurate consideration of its general and specific features. The world's revolutionary process is the "grid of coordinates" in which the proletarian liberation movement occupies a central position. The comprehensive and increasingly profound work on problems of the revolutionary process of our time is a distinguishing feature of social science studies conducted in recent years, the results of which have been embodied in our party's documents and activities and in the creative potential of the international communist movement. The range of specific problems covered by research in this area is exceptionally broad and varied. These problems have become the object of special studies by representatives of the various social sciences and, generally speaking, require particular attention. We can only reemphasize the fact that, while retaining its specific nature, the set of problems related to the global revolutionary process is closely intertwined with that of the international workers movement.

This intertwining has both a general theoretical and profoundly practical meaning. It underscores the importance of the problems which must be resolved by the Marxist-Leninist science of the working class under circumstances of a worsening worldwide class confrontation. The antilabor trend of state-monopoly control over the capitalist economy, the new forms of capitalist rule and exploitation, particularly those related to the expansion of multinational corporations, and the energizing of the opponents of detente who are focusing their efforts against the USSR and the other socialist countries which are the bastions of the social progress of all mankind are all factors which influence the conditions governing the development of the working class and the struggle for its vital requirements and its universal-historical objectives.

The Soviet social scientists must continue their profound and comprehensive study of the new phenomena and processes taking place within the working class itself

and of the positions and behavior of its various groups and the social dynamics of the other detachments of hired labor. Further work must be done on problems whose decision could effectively contribute to organizing the working people to counter the reactionary course of big capital with their own program for struggle against monopoly omnipotence, for democratic rights and freedoms and for the socialist future of their countries.

The tasks formulated by the 26th CPSU Congress call for paying greater attention to comprehensive program-target works on central problems affecting the life and struggle of the international working class and the workers movement. This includes topics such as summarizing the experience of the global communist movement, including its ideological and theoretical aspects; central problems of the class struggle waged by the proletariat and the development of antimonopoly movements at the contemporary phase of the scientific and technical revolution; basic trends in the trade union movement, including those related to countering the actions of multinational corporations; and problems related to the proletariat and to general democratic movements (historical and contemporary). The continuation and intensification of such studies, improved work coordination and the unification of the efforts of social scientists in various fields in the study of the topical problems of the workers movement is a prerequisite for success on the way earmarked by the 26th CPSU Congress.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

STAGES IN THE PROCESS OF THE BUILDING OF SOCIALISM IN THE USSR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 31-40

[Article by Academician M. Kim]

[Text] The contemporary stage in the activities of the CPSU is noted by a creative upsurge of collective theoretical thinking and of substantial accomplishments in this area. The documents of the 26th CPSU Congress, which offer a profound scientific solution to the most topical problems of social development, are proof of the tireless and fruitful work done by the Leninist party to improve and reinforce its ideological arsenal.

The CPSU focuses its attention on the basic problems of scientific communism as associated with the dynamic processes of the progress of real socialism. The party documents of the past 20 years are a valuable contribution to the Marxist-Leninist theory of communism and of its two stages. The party's elaboration of the concept of the developed socialist society is of outstanding significance. This concept was based on the concretization and creative enrichment of the theory of the communist system and on the scientific concepts of the stages and laws governing its establishments, contained in the works of K. Marx, F. Engels and V. I. Lenin, and in the documents of the CPSU and of the international workers movement. It was developed in the course of the scientific interpretation of the actual processes occurring in the building of socialism and communism and the all-round summation of the practical experience of the USSR and of the other members of the socialist comity. The conclusions and stipulations regarding mature socialism formulated in the CPSU documents, together with the conclusions and concepts formulated by the other fraternal parties, represent a new big step in the development of the theory and practice of scientific communism. They substantially broaden the range of our knowledge of the ways for the establishment and development of the new society and open inspiring historical prospects.

The ever greater dynamism and complexity of historical processes require the further intensification of the role of the social sciences. Naturally, the communist party is continual drawing the attention of the social scientists to the need to raise the qualitative standard of research and is directing them to the solution of topical problems. The 26th CPSU Congress reasserted the party's profound interest in achievements in the social sciences, mainly in the timely and appropriate interpretation of new social phenomena. The main direction of creative effort in the social sciences is that of the intensified development of the problems in theory and history of real socialism as the first stage of communism, and the solution of the new problems of the building of communism raised by practical work.

As far as the Soviet science of history is concerned, its topical tasks include the elaboration of a scientifically optimal variant for the stages of the history of the establishment and development of socialism in the USSR. We know that the establishment of such stages is not a mechanical division of the historical process but its demarcation in accordance with the qualitative characteristics of its individual stages, with a substantiated definition of their main content and dominent characteristics. The scientific division into periods of the history of the building of socialism and communism is invaluable in the study and profound understanding of it, in the light of historical experience, contemporary reality and the future.

Obviously, it would be premature to consider that we have already developed a single and universally accepted viewpoint on this matter. The different variants in the division of the history of the building of socialism into periods, found in scientific publications, are not entirely consistent with the strict requirements of the scientific division into stages and contain controversial aspects. Meanwhile, we find in the CPSU documents basic conclusions and concepts related to the most important stages in the history of socialism in the USSR. The duty of the historians is, on the basis of such summations, to suggest the variant for the division into periods of the history of the establishment and development of socialism most consistent with social reality, and to combine in this connection broad divisions with the required more detailed breakdown.

Before moving to specific aspects of the division into stages of the history of the establishment and development of socialism in the USSR, we should deal with a general problem of essential and methodological significance. This applies to the historical place of the transitional period, as is the name usually given to the stage of the revolutionary transformation of capitalism into socialism, the stage of laying the foundations for socialism. We must reach the single scientific decision according to which this period does not lie outside the limits of the communist system but is the initial link in its establishment. This conclusion clearly stems from the historical experience of the building of socialism and the theory of scientific communism. However, our publications are not entirely clear on this subject. Some authors assume that the transitional period is a time interval which does not belong to any specific system. This viewpoint developed as a result of an insufficiently thoughtful interpretation of the familiar view expressed by Marx in his "Critique of the Gotha Program" and Lenin's statements on problems of the transitional period from capitalism to communism. In his work, Marx wrote that "A period of revolutionary transformation of the first into the second lies between the capitalist and the communist society" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 19, p 27). In turn, Lenin pointed out that "Historically, there should unquestionably be a separate stage of transition from capitalism to communism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 33, p 86). However, does it follow from these views that this transitional stage does not belong to the communist system and that it should be considered as belonging to some intersystem category? Not in my opinion.

In terms of its time framework, nature and functional characteristics, the stage of transition from capitalism to communism is a stage in which the foundations for socialism are laid and its historical place is within the framework of the

socialist age which replaces the age of capitalism immediately following the victory of the proletarian revolution and the establishment of the political domination of the working class. Let me recall Lenin's words written in 1919 with a view to explaining the historical significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution: the overthrow of bourgeois rule and the creation of a Soviet system were "the beginning of a universal change in universal-historical ages: the age of the bourgeoisie and the age of socialism..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 38, 1920). In 1920 he wrote: "The destruction of capitalism and of its traces and the introduction of the foundations of a communist order are the content of the new epoch in universal history which is now beginning" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 41, p 425).

Initially the epoch of socialism was distinguished by features of a mixed system. It was of a transitional nature. It did not as yet presume social homogeneousness. Combined within it were the characteristics and features of socialist and non-socialist--capitalist and precapitalist--forms of social production. This characteristic of the initial stage of our epoch is determined by the typological charactistics of the proletarian revolution and the nature of the replacement of capitalism with socialism. Essentially, capitalism develops within feudalism; the bourgeois revolution merely continues or completes the process of assertion of capitalism and of its victory over feudalism. Under capitalist conditions, socialism finds merely the prerequisites for the subsequent victory over it while the victory itself is insured by the proletarian revolution on the basis of its further development during the transitional period.

The transitional period is a complex interweaving of a variety of phenomena and disparate processes, a picture of sharp confrontation between the old and the new, between the newly developing collectivistic-labor economic system and way of life and the adamantly resisting exploitation-private ownership traditions and elements, in the course of which the "who-whom" historical question is settled. Bearing in mind such a historical situation, would it be accurate to consider the transitional period as part of the socialist epoch? I believe that it would. The explanation for this is found both in Lenin's works and in historical reality.

V. I. Lenin taught that a historical epoch can be defined on the basis of the leading trends of social development, on the basis of the type of social force or class which plays a dominant role in it, "the type of class which is in the center of one or another age and which determines its main content, main direction of development and the main characteristics of the historical circumstances of a given epoch and so on" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 26, p 142). Unquestionably, it was the working class which was in the center of the socialist epoch and which determined the main content and main direction of social development under the conditions of the transitional period; it gave this period a socialist trend making it the basic and leading trend of social life. The dictatorship of the working class was the main weapon for the revolutionary reorganization of the capitalist society into a socialist society and for laying the foundations for socialism. In this case the ruling status of the communist party in the system of proletarian dictatorship and in all areas of social practice was of priceless importance. The party's theory and program became the firm foundation of state policy and of all efforts related to the socialist renovation of the country.

The Soviet system immediately abolished landed estates and big capitalist ownership. It carried out a governmental reorganization of large-scale production and nationalized banks and railroads. These and other revolutionary measures taken by the proletarian state strongly undermined the economic positions of capitalism. "This transitional period cannot be a period of struggle between dying capitalism and arising communism; in other words, it cannot be a struggle between defeated yet undestroyed capitalism and the born yet still very weak communism" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 271). Subsequently, relying on the toiling masses and under the leadership of the Leninist party, the Soviet state implemented a great program of revolutionary changes and socialist construction, which qualitatively changed the entire aspect of the society.

The elimination of private ownership over productive capital and the decisive steps taken for its socialization, the elimination of exploiting classes and of the exploitation of man by man, the successes achieved in the cultural revolution, the elimination of national inequality and the assertion of the equal and international cooperation among nations, together with other basic changes, were carried out in the transitional period, characterizing it as the initial stage of the building of socialism, as the first stage in the history of the new system.

Therefore, three stages may be singled out in the process of the establishment and development of the communist socioeconomic system: the two stages of communism itself, and the transitional period which precedes them, in the course of which the new socialist world is born in a fierce struggle against the old world. In his work "Marxism on the State," Lenin provides the following three-stage development of communism throughout history:

"Therefore: I. 'Long birth pains;' II. 'first phase of the communist society;' III. 'higher phase of the communist society'" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 33, p 185).

The period of laying the foundations for socialism (the transitional period) lasted through the first 20 years of the history of Soviet society. The demarcations of this period have been established quite clearly and have been universally accepted. On the one hand, they are the victory of the October Revolution and, on the other, the adoption of the 1936 USSR constitution which legislatively codified the victory of socialism in the country.

Within this 20 year period (1917-1936) historians single out three shorter stages which are distinguished by the nature of the revolutionary reorganization of capitalism into socialism and the specific historical conditions under which the building of socialism was carried out. They are: I. the October Revolution and the civil war (1917-1920); II. the restoration of the national economy (1921-1925); III. the reconstruction of the national economy and the victory of socialism (1926-1936).*

* The majority of methods currently used for division into periods single out more fractionalized stages. Thus, for example, three stages are singled out within the 1926-1936 period (1926-1929, 1929-1932, and 1933-1936). In my view, this is not entirely justified.

The building of socialism along its essential lines toward the end of the transitional period meant the beginning of the existence and functioning of the first phase of communism as well. Naturally, in considering its two phases, Lenin left open the question of the internal stages and levels of development of these phases. He taught that this is a matter of the historical experience of the specific future. Today such experience enables us to single out two stages in the history of the socialist phase: the early stage, in the course of which the building of developed socialism takes place, and the stage of the developed mature socialism itself, in the course of which it improves steadily and gradually develops into communism.

The stage of building developed socialism was longer than the transitional period. We can substantiate the fact that it took 40 years and that it lasted from 1937 to 1977. Within that period we can objectively single out four chronological periods determined by the characteristics of the domestic and international conditions of the country and the indicators of the maturing of socialism:

I. Start of the building of a developed socialist society (1937-1941);

II. The USSR in the period of the Great Patriotic War (1941-1945);

III. The postwar restoration of the country and the further development of the building of developed socialism (1945-1960);

IV. The building of a developed socialist society (in the 1961-1977 interval).

Since a great variety of opinions may be found in the literature on the time limits of the building of developed socialism in the USSR, let us specifically discuss the chronological aspect of this matter and the substantiation of its presumed boundaries.

Drawing lines during periods of peaceful development is almost always conventional, for it is impossible to determine their precise date. This applies even more to the dates marking the establishment of a developed socialist society, its initial stage in particular. This is related to the characteristics of developed socialism itself and the nature of its "introduction" into life.

Developed socialism is an integral social system all of whose coordinated structural components acquire a state of organic unity and harmonious interaction. The building of developed socialism means the conversion of the not fully integral and still developing socialist system into a fully integrated one. It means that all the elements in the system have matured and reached a level of total reciprocal coordination, and that the new system has matured in all the most important areas of social life. However, the coordination among the elements within the developed socialist system does not mean that this condition has been achieved at a precisely identifiable time or at any specific moment. On the contrary, a certain time sequence naturally occurs here: in some areas socialism matures faster and earlier than in others.

Naturally, a general period of time for the full ripening of socialism as an organic system exists. Within it, however, each of its parts has its own pace

and the length. For this reason, the building of developed socialism in the USSR was not a one-time act, occurring in a given year, but a process which covered a number of years rich in events. In the course of this process the already established characteristics of developed socialism were intertwined with others which were only apparent. The maturity of socialism did not occur simultaneously in all areas of social life but at different times, within the limits of a general period. Meanwhile, as its individual areas reached their maturity, socialism began to function in these areas as developed. In terms of time the beginning of the functioning of developed socialism corresponded to the duration of the entire period of its development.

Without laying any claim to the formulation of a full and definitive judgment, allow me to express my viewpoint on this matter. As a historian, I believe that the time limits of the building of developed socialism--the beginning and the end--may be marked by two noteworthy events which were inseparably linked with the destinies of real socialism in the USSR and its entry into maturity. The beginning is the adoption of the current CPSU program (1961), while the end is marked by the adoption of the new USSR constitution (1977). In other words, chronologically, this encompasses the 1960's and 1970's.

Objectively, the need for a third party program for the building of communism was dictated by the fact that in its progress Soviet society reached the threshold of developed socialism, the assertion and comprehensive advancement of which must lead to communism. The party and the people had to be armed with a program for action along this way and given a clear idea of the communist future. The adoption of the new constitution was determined by the vital need for the legislative codification of the historical gains of socialism achieved with its conversion to a mature stage. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized, this marked the "constitutional codification of the new historical level reached in our progress toward communism--the building of a developed socialist society." The new constitution of the USSR is the fundamental law of the first state of the whole people in the world.

The adoption of the new constitution was in a way a result of the entire period of the building of developed socialism. In my view, it would be pertinent at this point to find an historical analogy. The view that the adoption of the 1936 constitution marked the end of the period of laying the foundations of socialism has been already firmly established in historiography. Consequently, the fact that a similar role may be assigned to the historical fact of the adoption of the 1977 constitution in terms of the period of building developed socialism is explainable, justifiable and legitimate also from the viewpoint of the general approach to the division into periods and of continuity under similar circumstances.

Therefore, the entry of the USSR into the stage of developed socialism is an historical landmark whose chronological framework covers slightly more than 15 years. Attempts to ascribe to this landmark any given specific year--1959, 1961, 1966, 1971 or 1977--are pointless, for it covers an entire historical period. This does not conflict in the least with the fact that this landmark represents a qualitative leap in the development of Soviet society. In the course of this leap a process of meaningful acquisition of the characteristics of developed socialism in all the most important realms of social life took place and conditions governing its independent functioning were established.

Soviet society entered the period of developed socialism in the fifth and sixth decades of its history. It would be impossible to predict the stages through which this period will develop and the time they will take. All this will be determined by historical circumstances, both domestic and foreign, and it is hardly possible that all of them can be predicted. The only clear thing in this respect is that we are in the beginning stage of a long and meaningful period.

The nature and chacteristics of developed socialism and of its laws were brought up in the CPSU documents and extensively covered in scientific publications. Let us consider merely a few main aspects of the problem directly related to the subject of this article.

In his article "An Historical Landmark on the Road to Communism" (1977) Comrade L. I. Brezhnev described the general aspects of the new stage. He wrote: "...Today developed socialism has been built in the USSR, i.e., a level of maturity of the new society has been reached in which the reorganization of the sum of social relations on collectivistic principles internally inherent in socialism is completed." Collectivism is the main essential feature of communism. As the first phase of communism, socialism is the beginning of the truly collective life of the people. The reorganization of the sum of social relations on a collectivistic basis is a complex and comprehensive process involving a variety of changes which lead to the total and definitive assertion of the principles and norms of general collectivism in life.

This comprehensive process is organically interwoven with the further humanizing of human activities, which is one of the essential characteristics of mature socialism. The growth of collectivism expresses the humanistic nature of socialism which is brought up ever more completely and effectively at its mature stage. The improvement of social relations and of the way of life of the Soviet people on the basis of systematic humanistic principles is determined by the increased role of the human factor in the course of socialist progress, increased concern shown by society for the people and the manifestation of the people's various capabilities and the satisfaction of their various needs.

Man's significance as the subject of historical creativity becomes greater than ever before under mature socialist conditions. The task of the comprehensive development of the individual and of the molding of the new people has assumed priority in social strategy. "Everything for the sake of man and the good of man"--the formula recorded in the CPSU program--has become the party's and the people's most important requirement at the present stage of their constructive activities. This requirement is the focal point of the economic and social policy of the communist party and the Soviet state. It expresses concern for the material and spiritual life of man in their indivisible unity. Starting with the 24th CPSU Congress, the enhancement of the people's well-being, based on the dynamic and proportional development of social production, has been invariably formulated as the party's main task.

The humanistic policy of the Leninist party was extended and concretized in the documents of the 26th CPSU Congress. In defining the tasks for economic and social development in the 1980's, the congress stipulated that "...The communist party will systematically pursue the implementation of its economic strategy whose

supreme objective is the undeviating upsurge of the material and cultural living standards of the people, the creation of better conditions for the all-round development of the individual, on the basis of the further enhancement of the effectiveness of the entire social production process, increased labor productivity, and rise in the social and labor activity of the Soviet people."

The communist party, which pays tremendous attention to cultural growth concurrently with the material security of the working people, proceeds from the unavoidable fact of the tremendously increased role of the spiritual principle in the life of the Soviet people and in their constructive efforts. The present and the future of socialism and its progress to communism decisively depend on the idea-mindedness, moral standard and culture of the masses. Without high cultural and educational standards, high social conciousness and internal maturity of people, communism is as impossible as it would be without a proper material and technical foundation.

Developed socialism functions and is improved as an integral social system. We already considered the question of its establishment in connection with the duration of this process. Let us now emphasize that mature socialism is an existing social organism which can reveal its potential in all areas of social life and which can insure their coordinated development. At the 24th CPSU Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev already said that "As we know, in the initial stages of the building of socialism we were forced to concentrate on priorities... The situation now is different. We not only want, for we have always wanted this, but we can and must also resolve simultaneously a broader range of problems.... We no longer can rush ahead in one or another area, regardless of its importance, while allowing others to fall substantially behind in terms of the modern science of management. One of the most essential stipulations is for the party to resolve all problems of social development comprehensively, in a state of harmony and interrelationship. The comprehensive approach to the management of social progress has many aspects. It includes the combination of economic with social development and of material with spiritual factors; it requires coordination in the development of industry and agriculture and in the observance of proportions between them and within them; it requires the coordination of progress in the production area and the infrastructure, optimum cooperation among republics in economic and cultural development, interaction between society and the environment and so on. Considerable successes have been achieved in all directions of comprehensive economic and social development. However, many unresolved problems remain. This is explained not only by objective circumstances but also by subjective reasons, essentially by shortcomings in organization and weaknesses in cultural work.

The party is always concerned with insuring the progress of the Soviet society in all its strata and at all levels on a coordinated frontal basis. This is an essential important policy, particularly in terms of long-range developments. Society cannot convert from socialism to communism partially, on the basis of professional or national groups or geographic or administrative units. The gradual equalization of the levels of material and cultural life of people engaged in various occupations and professions, inhabiting different parts of the country, living in cities or villages and so on, is one of the most important tasks requiring an exhaustive solution in the course of the advancement of developed socialism and of the creation of prerequisites for its direct growth into communism.

At the present stage of the building of communism, when the stage of mature socialism has been reached, the problem of the correlation between socialism and communism assumes a particular not only theoretical but practical interest. In principle the Marxists resolved it a long time ago. Specifically, however, its analysis reveals a certain lack of clarity and, occasionally, even confusion and erroneous interpretations. In this case, my remark applies to a confusion of the concepts of "socialist" and "communist" as used in daily life and in literature.

The word "communist" is frequently used when the word "socialist" would be more suitable. Lenin cautioned against all misuses of the term "communist." In order to avoid annoying vagueness, we must distinguish between two aspects of the concept of "communism:" the general-system and the intrasystem stage. Communism, considered on the general system level, covers socialism as well as its initial phase. On the basis of this definition of communism, the word "communist" is applicable to socialism as well, to its laws, and to anything it creates. For example, from this viewpoint the term "the developed building of communism" is entirely applicable to the current stage in the history of Soviet society, for the functioning and advancement of mature socialism provides adequate grounds for this. However, if we consider communism in its intrasystem stage level, i.e., as the higher phase of the communist system, the "developed building of communism" will be more consistent with the stage of the direct transition from socialism to communism, the stage at which the lower phase of the communist system turns into the higher stage. Understandably, the approach to this term and to its application must always be accurately interpreted and its significance within the proper context taken into consideration.

In practical life any confusion or misuse involving the word "communist" is created, as a rule, by the good intention of anticipating events and of determining their course. However, such an attitude toward the phenomena and processes of social life is fraught with adverse consequences, particularly in terms of a phenomenon such as labor. We must not mix two different historical categories--socialist labor and communist labor. Despite all the common features which link them as the labor of free workers, working for themselves and for society, each of them has its characteristic features and time limits. In order for society to convert from socialist to communist labor a tremendous growth of production forces, highly advanced social relations and new standards in the material and cultural life of the working people will be required. The anticipation of events must adversely affect the production process and disorient the people in their daily life. The history of the building of socialism in the USSR includes many outstanding cases of communist attitudes toward labor and new shoots of communist labor are appearing at all times. Nevertheless, under socialist conditions labor, based on the socialist principle of working to the full extent of one's capabilities and being rewarded in accordance with the quantity and quality of the labor, remains the supreme duty of the working people. The strict observance of the principle of distribution according to labor is one of the basic conditions for the development of socialist public production.

Any violation of this principle causes society substantial material and moral harm. The 26th CPSU Congress firmly condemned once again such phenomena: "Only labor--its quantity and quality--can be the principal criterion for distribution

under socialism. Unfortunately, this is not always the case in practice. Any kind of equalization, wages paid essentially for showing up at work rather than for real results, or the payment of undeserved bonuses have an extremely harmful effect on both production indicators and the people's mentality."

Particular attention should be paid also to the problem of the gradual growth of socialism into communism. This is one of the fundamental stipulations of the doctrine of the communist system and the correlation between its two phases.

There are two extremes in the understanding and interpretation of the nature of the process of growth of socialism into communism. Sometimes this process is depicted as a revolution affecting either the entire society or its individual aspects. We read a work on history in which the transition from socialism to communism is interpreted thusly: "The essential feature of this great social revolution is that it does not win as a result of the struggle between antagonistic classes, for they no longer exist in the developed socialist society." According to some authors, the development of culture in the course of the growth of socialism into communism will take the aspect of a revolution. We know, however, that one and the same Marxist-Leninist ideology is the typological characteristic of socialist and communist culture. The growth of socialist into communist culture means the transition from one stage to another within the framework of a common type of culture. Understandably, there could be no question here of a revolution. From my viewpoint, the social scientists are not as yet taking properly into consideration Marx' stipulation that in a society without classes and class antagonisms "social evolutions will no longer represent political revolutions" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 4, p 185).

The other extreme is the view that socialism gradually grows into communism in the course of an absolutely continuing process in which no quality leaps or levels may be identified. This "theory" of gradual development leads to a confusion between the terms "socialist" and "communist." It is manifested, in particular, in the neglect of time limits in the process of changes in the correlation between the two. In this case the range of the principles and norms of life inherent in each of the two phases of communism is ignored. In the course of the growth of socialism into communism, the process reflects the dialectic unity between non-interruption and interruption. However gradual this growth process may be, it will have its qualitatively different stages.

As we already stressed, it would be impossible to determine the nature of these stages on the specific historical level. However, if we consider this problem in its essence, we can single out a priori two stages, distinguished by the level reached by developed socialism and the nature of its growth into communism. In the first stage, all essential changes in socialist reality notwithstanding, it is obvious that the socialist laws, principles and norms will predominate (earlier attempts to curtail their effect turned into an unjustified forcing of events and harmful haste). It is only during the following stage, when socialism reaches a high level of perfection and when all the necessary prerequisites for the conversion to communism have been created, that the socialist laws, principles and norms will be replaced by communist ones. In these two stages the growth of the first phase into the second will take place at two substantially different historical levels.

At the first stage, when the comprehensive improvement of the socialist organization of society and the strengthening of its principles and norms become the center of gravity, this growth is indirect. In other words, the transition to communism cannot be conceived in any way other than through the strengthening and total implementation of specifically socialist requirements. At the second stage, the growth of socialism into communism must be direct, i.e., the transition to the second phase will take place through the substitution of the principles and norms of communism for those of socialism. Naturally, this will take place when socialism has exhausted its creative possibilities entirely and when all the necessary prerequisites for its transformation into a communist society have matured.

One of the essentially important conclusions stemming from the theory of developed socialism is that, unquestionably, it will function and advance over a long period of time. A relatively long period of time will be necessary for socialism to be able to create all the necessary prerequisites for communism and for a direct transition to it. This conclusion is of major theoretical and practical significance, as it gives us a proper orientation in assessing the role of historical time and in helping us to think and approach the tasks of the building of communism realistically.

These are some of the problems related to the history of the establishment of socialism in the USSR in terms of its division into periods.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

IN THE SPIRIT OF REVOLUTIONARY TRADITIONS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 41-53

[Article by Jan Fojtik, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee secretary, on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. The present article is published simultaneously in Issue No 5 for 1981 of NOVA MYSL, the theoretical and political journal of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee]

> [Text] "The revolutionary vanguard of the Czechoslovak proletariat, which proved itself to be the most progressive political force in Czechoslovak history, in the history of our peoples, appeared as the result of the founding of a Marxist-Leninist party. It was only under the leadership of the communist party that our people were able to defeat the bourgeoisie and reach the socialism of today."
>
> Gustav Husak. From the Central Committee accountability report to the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

The 16th CPCZ Congress, which was held from 6 to 10 April 1981, convincingly proved the moral-political strength of our party and its Marxist-Leninist nature, unity, organization and ideological maturity. It proved that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia enjoys a high reputation among our people and the international revolutionary movement. The congress answered the main questions related to the further development of our society and the domestic and foreign policies of the state. It extended the program for the building of developed socialism in our country in accordance with the conditions of the present historical stage and existing possibilities. This program which, as we know, was adopted at the 1971 14th CC CPCZ Congress as the party's long-term general line, was confirmed at the two subsequent congresses. Its implementation insures the steady development of our country within the family of the members of the socialist comity as well as the sovereignty and freedom of our peoples and of confidence in the future, gained by the working class and the people in the course of the revolutionary battles and the building of socialism.

The precongress period and the congress itself were marked by the exceptionally high social and labor activeness of communists and other citizens, united within the National Front. The congress intensified and strengthened the trust of the

people in the party's policy even further. It strengthened their will and resolve to implement the new plans despite all difficulties, and to follow the road leading to the ultimate objective--communism--more daringly.

The fact that our people are actively supporting the party's policy and identify with the party entirely is deeply rooted in their historical experience. In the course of the dedicated battles fought by the party for the interests and rights of the working people and for the very existence of our peoples and their future, the masses have frequently seen the value of the party's word. In the struggle for bread and work, in the time of Munich, in the period of occupation and in the course of the revolution and the building of the new life, the party always marched with the people and never separated itself from it. Thousands and thousands of party members dedicated all they had, including their lives, for the sake of the interests of the people and the happy future of their homeland. Our people will never forget that it was only under the leadership of the communist party that they were able to reject capitalist rule, insure their national sovereignty and become the real masters of their country. They were given repeated proofs that the party will remain loyal to the objectives it had set itself at its birth, nearly six decades ago, and that the meaning of its policy has always been to insure the well-being of the working people and to serve the working class and all working people.

The broad and energetic support on which the party relies in its daily work among the masses, its strong ties with the working class, the cooperated peasantry and the intelligentsia, with all strata of the nations and nationalities inhabiting socialist Czechoslovakia and the unity between party and people represent the fixed capital with which the CPCZ is approaching its important anniversary. This is a most valuable possession which gives it the unquestionable right, as the leading political force in the National Front, to seek approval for its policy, as the policy of all working people, in the forthcoming elections for legislative and representative organs.

In a nation's history six decades is a relatively short period, shorter than the average lifespan of a person. Nevertheless, we can say that during the life of the CPCZ, particularly in the period during which it has been the vanguard of the ruling working class, historically unparalleled events and changes have taken place in the life of our country.

Whenever we use words such as "events," "changes of historical significance" and so on, we must always beware of the danger of depreciating them. However, it would be unwise to avoid the use of such words. In this case, we have in mind not only what is part of and belongs to the past but what has been accomplished for the future as well. The future will single out what we know as historical reality and will decide what belongs to history. The future alone can classify facts into "historical" and into activities which history sifts out, frequently regardless of what the contemporaries may have thought of the actions and accomplishments of their immediate predecessors. Practical experience and the outcome of social battles turn the class struggle into a jungle. A given event becomes historical less because of the way it has shaken up the structure of the past than mainly the extent to which it makes effective use of everything prepared by history for the creation of a new social reality with its new forms and new vital content.

From such a viewpoint, when contemporaneity is mercilessly compared with the past and that which is today with what was less than 40 years ago, we can boldly pit our socialist present against the century which preceded it.

The revolution, which brought about the birth of a new society, means to our peoples more than a simple historical milestone. In the course of it, we not only parted with the age-old past of the exploiting system but forever linked our destinies with those to whom the Great October Socialist Revolution had already opened the path to a new era--the era of socialism and communism. True, we are only beginning to write the chronicles of the new history. It is only today that the foundations are being laid for that great future, for the revolutionary rebirth of all mankind. However, it is precisely for this reason that we can speak even more proudly of our most modern history as the living reality of this inevitable future of mankind.

The founding of the revolutionary vanguard of the Czechoslovak proletariat--the Czechoslovak Communist Party--marked its indisputable beginning in our country. Without this truly most important historical accomplishment which was achieved six decades ago by the most conscientious part of the working class and by its best and most courageous sons, who headed the struggle for giving a socialist nature to the just created state--the Czechoslovak Republic--with boundless loyalty, there would have been no socialism in our country.

In the final account, all the attacks mounted by the enemies of our people are directed against the communist party. It was precisely the communist party that has always defeated subversive counterrevolutionary plans and intrigues. Our enemies shy at no slander in their efforts to compromise the party in the eyes of the toiling masses at home and abroad. What they dislike in our party, mainly in its principle-minded policy, is that it is guided in its activities by the theory, strategy and tactics of Leninism. Leninism, which is the Marxism of our age and the practice of our revolution and of the building of socialism in Czechoslovakia, proved itself to be a proper doctrine, a reliable tool for the radical reorganization of society and the liberation of the working person. It is the live and inexhaustible source of the creative strength and energy of the party and the people and the inviolable foundation of our successes and victories.

The consistent internationalism of the CPCZ is a thorn in the flesh of our adversaries. Loyalty to proletarian internationalism is a criterion of the revolutionism of any party which acts on behalf of the working class and in its defense. This is manifested not only in the fact that our party joined the Communist International and rallied within its ranks the revolutionary proletariat of all nations and nationalities on Czechoslovak territory, but also that, as the only political force in the pre-Munich republic, it realized the organic tie existing between the national interests and the defense of the first state of workers and peasants--the Soviet Union--and the vital need for an alliance and friendship between the peoples of Czechoslovakia and of the USSR. The party acted accordingly, regardless of the fact that anyone who showed an open sympathy for the Soviet Union was persecuted.

As we know, one of the main assignments which the counterrevolution set for itself toward the end of the 1960s was the elimination of this great tradition and the "reorganization" of the party in such a way as to make it abandon its international obligations and break the fraternal ties linking it with the CPSU and the other revolutionary parties.

Actually, what could illustrate more clearly the true intent of the promoters of the "process of rebirth" than the base attempt to crush one of the most important behests and gains of our contemporary history and our revolution? The simple elimination of the party and its removal from the political stage was impossible, regardless of all the efforts to accomplish this. That is why the reaction tried to change the nature of the party and force it to review its program, to reject Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism, to change its class structure and turn into an instrument for the destruction of socialism and for including our country in an imperialist system. The failure of these attempts and the restoration of the Marxist-Leninist character of our party and of its leading role in society after April 1969 is one of the most outstanding stages in the most recent history of our peoples and of the party.

The fact that the CPCZ honorably surmounted the tremendous difficulties of that period was rated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev highly. Speaking from the rostrum of our party's 16th congress, he said: "The victory over the counterrevolutionary forces in 1968 and the ability to draw profound long-range political conclusions from those events are a major contribution made by the Czechoslovak communists to the development of the world's revolutionary process and to all fraternal countries."

The 60-year history of our party depicts a truly splendid road. The party had to surmount tremendous difficulties, withstand severe trials and experience difficult situations along this way before it became the acknowledged political party of our society, the party of the working class, and before the Czechoslovak people were to entrust it with the destinies of the state. The path of the communists was never lined with roses. They joined the party to struggle for the freedom of the toiling man. Each victory won by the party was the result of stubborn battles and each of them required deprivations and sacrifices. The more substantive and durable the results of this common struggle, the more significant was the role of those who did not betray it even under the most difficult circumstances.

Let us consider even though briefly the historical path, the legacy of the past, the way it supports us and the lessons it has taught us and which are still pertinent to our present work.

Let us recall, first of all, that the very appearance of the party was preceded by a long prehistory of the activities of the pioneers of socialism, who became organized in the 1870s within a social democratic party in the then-Austria-Hungary. By the turn of the century the labor movement in Czechoslovakia became dramatically energized. It became a question of creating an organization which would not only rally the workers in the struggle against the coarsest forms of exploitation and oppression and for basic social demands but would raise this struggle to the level of political battles and become the acknowledged and worthy representative of the working class in such battles, including the battles for the preservation of our national autonomy and for acquiring state sovereignty. This aim

required the workers party to mold the revolutionary awareness of the toiling masses. It is only thus that a social force, aware of its place in the contemporary history of our peoples and its hegemonistic role in the broad social strata, rather than acting as an appendage to the liberal bourgeoisie (most of whose representatives wore themselves out in nationalistic disputes which did not go beyond the framework of Austrian conformism), could develop out of an unorganized workers mass.

We know that the social democratic party failed to carry out this task which it was even unable to define for itself.

We shall always greatly honor the memory of the first organizers of the labor movement in our country, J. B. Pecka, L. Zapotocky-Budecky and all those who struggled for making the ideas of Marx' and Engels' "Communist Party Manifesto" and of scientific socialism part of the spontaneous struggle of the masses. There were only a handful of them and each of them was the victim of incredible persecutions. However, the moral strength with which they withstood all trials was boundless, the convictions with which they struggled for the cause of the working class were inflexible and the optimism with which they looked at the future was unbreakable. Nevertheless, the revolutionary banner they passed on to the next generation could not be raised over the new class battles.

It was precisely at that time, when the workers movement had become noticeably broader and stronger (the first Russian revolution, like all subsequent revolutionary events in Russia, provided a powerful impulse and had a tremendous impact on our countries) and the social democratic leaders were so strongly influenced by revisionist views and opportunistic practices, that the bourgeoisie which, meanwhile, had also realized the great advantage of corrupting the labor "leaders" and bribing them to gain all the necessary opportunities for influencing this movement, weakening and disorganizing it and depriving it of its revolutionary potential. When the time for fighting decisive battles against the bourgeoisie came, the social democratic leadership abandoned the people's masses and pushed them into the arms of the reaction and of nationalistic demagogy which the masses were unable to oppose.

Radicalized by the war and the example of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the members of the social democratic party assumed the leadership of the impoverished masses who were tortured by hunger and were dreaming of peace and of a new and truly free life. However, no force existed as yet to rally them within a single revolutionary current, to control their actions and guide them firmly toward the creation of a workers state. Although the people's masses worked harder than anyone else for the destruction of the hated monarchy and the creation of a Czechoslovak republic, in the final accounting it was the bourgeoisie that benefited from the results of their struggle. Furthermore, the so-called leaders of the working class, "the right-wing opportunists, who were justifiably labeled as social chauvinists," helped to destroy the best part of the people, the true representatives and defenders of the people's interests.

For two years the bourgeoisie lived in a state of fear. Its political representatives competed in assuring the public of their "also socialist" way of thinking and sympathy for the workers. Once the bourgeoisie was able to strengthen its

position with the help of the right-wing social democrats it put an end to this false game and savagely turned against the labor movement. This was the first manifestation of Masaryk-style democracy. The bourgeoisie mercilessly dispersed striking workers with bayonets and truncheons or, whenever this proved to be insufficient, with rifle fire. The right-wing social democratic leaders, who had been bought by the bourgeoisie with ministerial portfolios and cozy and well-paid positions, carried out their sinister project to its end: on the eve of the decisive battle they promoted a division within the working class and the labor movement. With the help of this base treason, factory owners, landlords and financial magnates seized the power in the young country and, following the example of their Western patrons, immediately presented themselves to the working class and the working people as the "defenders" of democracy and freedom.

However, the stakes in this game were even higher. The new state was asked to pay a stiff price for its freedom which, it was claimed, had been granted to it and which could be taken away any time, unless its rulers served Western interests unswervingly, i.e., the interests of American, French and British big capital. At that time, such interests were focused on the demand to participate in the crusade against the first state of workers and peasants which had just come into being, the republic of soviets, and in the creation of the infamous anti-Soviet "cordon sanitaire." As we know, Czechoslovakia had been assigned an important role in this project. The social democratic bosses undertook to participate in this dirty deal. They were well aware of the strength of our workers' movement and of the sympathy with which the birth of Soviet Russia, in whose direction all exploited and oppressed people turned, was welcomed. It was no accident that the betrayal of the people by the right-wing social democrats was paralleled by the betrayal of the international revolutionary workers' movement. Since then such betrayals have always walked hand in hand with malicious anti-Sovietism.

It was thus that, for the first time in our most recent history, opportunism and revisionism showed up entirely naked, and it was thus that the significance and the extent of their duplicity became apparent. The proclamation of a policy of "class peace," nationalism and toothless liberalism pursued the exclusive aim of dulling and corrupting the class awareness of the masses and preventing the working class from realizing its role as a revolutionary force which must play a leading role in the struggle for true democracy, freedom and socialism. A legitimate answer to this crying case of treason was the decision of the leftist majority of the social democrats to separate themselves once and for all from the entire opportunistic legacy and to found a new truly revolutionary party, loyal to the cause of the working class and able to lead the masses in the struggle against exploiters and capitalism and for the overthrow of bourgeois power, the establishment of the power of the people's masses and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

As the example of the Russian Bolsheviks proved, this was the only way leading to the liberation of the working people. This was confirmed by the subsequent development of the Czechoslovak labor movement under the leadership of its revolutionary vanguard--the communist party--whose existence dates from 14 May 1921, the day its constituent congress convened.

The new party which in our case became a mass party from its very beginning, requested membership in the Comintern, which was created by V. I. Lenin in March 1919. We considered as exceptionally favorable the circumstance that Lenin, the brilliant leader of the international proletariat, the organizer of the October Revolution and the founder of the Soviet republic, the only person who could develop the doctrine of K. Marx and F. Engels in accordance with the requirements of the new age of transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism, stood by the cradle of our party. Lenin displayed unusually alert interest in the problems facing our party and in the formulation of its program and the training of cadres. He was concerned with its revolutionary orientation. He frequently discussed this matter with representatives of our party, Bohumir Smeral above all. Let us add that these talks were frequently polemical. Lenin fully supported B. Smeral's efforts to preserve a big and strong party which could influence the broad toiling masses; to a certain extent he also shared Smeral's fears of left-wing adventurism. However, he firmly asked of B. Smeral not to remain in a "state of expectation," justifying himself with references to various obstacles. Lenin considered such passive expectation and references to objective circumstances and difficulties symptoms of cowardice and opportunism.

At the 3rd Comintern Congress of July 1921, when the question of the acceptance of our party as a member of this international revolutionary organization was under discussion, Lenin firmly rejected Blanquism and the irresponsible and adventuristic approach to preparations for a revolution. However, he opposed even more firmly those who stated that it was necessary to wait until the revolution was started by another more developed country with a bigger population. "...This is not a communist interpretation but an open fraud," was Lenin's characterization of such dodges ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 61).

As existing documents confirm, Lenin based his assessment of our party's situation on a thorough analysis. He demanded that decisions on any problem affecting the work of one or another party be taken only after thorough study and exchange of views and in accordance with the characteristics governing the development of the respective country. It is precisely on the basis of such an analysis that he reached the conclusion that B. Smeral was wrong in equating right-wing opportunism with leftism. "These errors are not comparable. The theory that we shall make a revolution but only after others have made it is radically wrong," Lenin explained to our comrades (Ibid.).

The subsequent course of events confirmed Lenin's sagacity and the grounds for his fears, which stemmed from his profound understanding of the complex situation which had developed within the Czechoslovak Communist Party immediately after its founding, and from his understanding of the danger which the still unsurmounted social democratic movement presented to the new revolutionary party. It was only gradually, in the course of sharp conflicts and clashes and of a principled struggle for the mastering of Leninism, its theory, strategy, tactics and methods of influence that the habits and false views imposed on the working masses by opportunists and revisionists over many decades could be surmounted. The first major crisis faced by our party, which occurred in 1925, could be traced to the underestimating of this disease inherited from right-wing opportunism. A similar situation prevailed in the case of the second and far more serious crisis, the

surmounting of which was, above all, the work of Klement Gottwald and of the party's leadership which rallied around him after 1929.

Many among those who address themselves today to that period and undertake the close study of the reasons for the then recurrent cases of right-wing opportunism, may be amazed by the fact that some representatives of the right-wing, such as Ilek and Bolen, whose capitulationist attitude had brought the party to the brink of dismemberment, began by being quite radical left-wingers. Subsequently as well a similar phenomenon could be encountered frequently. There is nothing amazing in this. Any opportunism, whether on the right or the left, is, essentially, unprincipled pragmatism characterized by neglect of theory and of scientific principles. Guided by what seems advantageous at a given moment, and sacrificing all principles for this sake, opportunism (which may mislead some people) acts cautiously, cunningly and loudly and noisily, formulating the type of slogan which could yield it momentary benefits. To the extent to which base mercantilism and pimping are inherent in any petit bourgeois, the petit bourgeois loves to don someone else's garb. The petit bourgeois is always concerned with making himself look different from what he really is. Opportunism is legitimately connected to formalism. Demagogy (pseudonationality) is one of its particularly dangerous weapons. Having thoroughly analyzed the petit bourgeois nature of a great variety of types of opportunism, the founders of scientific socialism repeatedly pointed out its duplicity and the way it could change its positions, ideas and labels easily and rapidly, without any pangs of the conscience, and the extent to which the various "friends of the people" and the "superpatriots" were antipeople and antipatriotic.

As many people still remember well, we witnessed the way the right-wing opportunists and revisionists of the 1960s, who so willingly opened the doors to the counterrevolution, began by experiencing a kind of "transmutation" from former "leftist" dogmatists and sectarians into loyal servants of the West. Frightened by the circumstances of that time, which were temporarily favorable to capitalism, and by the imaginary crisis within our movement, they were ready to do even the most dirty work against socialism, following the scenario developed by the likes of Mr. Brzezinski and company in the United States.

It could hardly be considered accidental that today the majority of these "humane socialists," reformers and "renovators of communism," as they pompously describe themselves for the sake of concealing the true objectives of their subversive activities, are working in the anticommunist centers, which are engaged in a frenzied campaign against our country and people. No longer needing a mask, today they do not conceal their hatred of socialism. Some of them have even taken the side of the revanchists and the fascists. However, we must point out that in both our history and that of the international workers movement, this is far from being the first case of such a shameful failure of the renegades. In the final account, this is merely the dirty foam which, sooner or later, is cast aside by the powerful and insurmountable current.

The passing of time further emphasizes the role of individuals who, from the very first days of the creation and throughout the entire subsequent development of the party history, struggled for its revolutionary character and for making the party

a true vaguard of the working class and the toiling masses, for enabling it to pursue its activities as a party of a new type, a Leninist party. Klement Gottwald will always hold a leading position among them.

Klement Gottwald's life and activities symbolize the historical struggle waged by the party for its revolutionary nature, a struggle against all manifestations of opportunism, cowardice and pseudoradicalism. It was thanks to him that the party acquired Bolshevik features and qualities which enabled it successfully to wage class battles against capital and the nationwide struggle against fascism and for the freedom and statehood of our peoples, for a people's regime and for the victory of socialism. Klement Gottwald's name will be forever linked with the February 1948 victory of the working class and the beginning of the building of socialism, whose program he elaborated in the spirit of Lenin's theory of socialism.

A zealous patriot, a man who always spoke proudly of the great revolutionary and progressive past of his people, of the Hussite movement, the national renaissance, the fighters at the 1848 barricades and the behests of the first organizers of the labor movement, firmly linked with his people and with the class from which he came, Gottwald was also a profoundly systematic internationalist. To him this meant unquestionable and inflexible loyalty to the Soviet Union. He emphasized that this loyalty will always remain the cornerstone of the true patriotism and true internationalism of every Czechoslovak communist and progressive citizen who cares for the fate of his homeland and for its happy future in freedom and peace.

The assumption of the party's leadership by Gottwald made it immediately clear that a new spirit will prevail in the party. Bolshevization, which the Fifth CPCZ Congress set as the cornerstone of its policy once again in 1929, this time unequivocally, and the firmness with which it defeated the opportunistic wing frightened the bourgeoisie which mounted a fierce campaign of persecution of the party. Meanwhile, several noted men of culture and the arts left the party, driven away by the strict party discipline. Subsequently, most of them returned to the party but some of them switched to the enemy camp. In the subsequent period of our party's development, as well as today, all of this may prove to be very instructive to some people in the West who have fallen under the influence of the theoreticians of the so-called Eurocommunism (about which S. Carrillo, one of its founders, recently stated that it is experiencing a deep crisis). Our experience confirms clearly and convincingly that the masses can be won over only on the basis of a principled policy rather than on unprincipled bartering or concessions in the interest of "retaining one's positions in parliament" or in any other organ of the bourgeois political machine. Naturally, by this we mean the type of influence on the masses which does not fear temporary losses or sacrifice ideas for the sake of temporary advantages.

The party continued to gain position as a result of its principled policy, based on a clear and effective ideological platform, a tactic founded on a long-term theoretically substantiated strategy of struggle and on the systematic defense of the basic interests of the people and of the vital national interests which, as the fascist threat grew, assumed ever greater priority as the most important cause of the people's masses oppressed by big capital. The number of its supporters and

followers rose steadily. Its prestige among the broad social strata rose and the most conscientious representatives of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia joined its ranks. It could be boldly said that the healthy nucleus of Czechoslovak culture and art was within the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and that those among the best people who were not party members followed the party, fought for its ideas and disseminated them, proudly marching under the red banners at May Day demonstrations, fighting for the diplomatic recognition of the USSR and for concluding a treaty of alliance and friendship with it, and boldly disseminating the truth about the country of liberated labor. This is exemplified by Zdenek Needly, who was with the party from its very creation and was the first to welcome in the press the election of Klement Gottwald as CPCZ general secretary.

When the direct menace of the brown Hitlerite plague threatened the republic, the communist party was the only one among the then large number of parties which was ready to defend the homeland to its last drop of blood, which did not bow its head even in the face of the Munich dictate and which condemned the betrayal of the Western allies and of the national bourgeoisie, which rejected the helpful hand offered by the Soviet Union. From the very first days the CPCC organized the resistance to fascism. Thousands of its sons and daughters were executed and perished in concentration camps. Many died in partisan battles or at the barricades. Fucik, Zika, Vancura, Osoga....the list of names of party communist-patriot heroes is endless.

Paradoxical though it might seem, following the liberation of the country by the Soviet Army, the party came out of the war even stronger than ever before. Its influence and prestige in society had become substantially higher. The heroism and dedication of the communists had yielded results. In the postwar period, the CPCZ became the leading ruling party and ruling power in the National Front, which it had created during the struggle against fascism. The National Front rallied the broadest possible masses of the Czechoslovak people who were trying not only to regain their lost freedom and sovereignty but to create a state which would become their true fatherland and in which the solution of all social problems would be entrusted to them. Socialism not only promised a new and truly popular and democratic country, whose principles were formulated in the familiar Kosice program formulated by Klement Gottwald, but also insured the necessary sociopolitical and economic prerequisites for its creation.

The position which the party assumed in the new governmental power structure arose from an entirely new and truly exceptional situation, unparalleled in the history of our society. It was no longer a question of forming a governmental coalition, which would not affect the socioeconomic and class foundations or the domination of big capital, but of establishing a political system which, in Klement Gottwald's words, would reflect the assumption of power by the new class, the working class allied with the entire toiling people of town and country.

This was a natural and entirely legitimate process, in the same way that everything about the compromised bourgeoisie, which was seeking aid and refuge from the West, was historically anachronistic and illegal. This was the irreversible result of the struggle in the course of which the communist party proved that it is the true representative of the working class and the Czechoslovak

people, the spokesman for its national interests and the most systematic fighter for the satisfaction of sociopolitical demands. This made it possible to complete the struggle at this historical stage, resulting in the state of dictatorship of the proletariat, and to enter the next historical stage, whose immediate objective was laying the foundations for socialism.

It was precisely this new stage, specifically criticized by our various enemies later, that indicated the meaning of the liberation of the creative energy of the masses and the way the state of proletarian dictatorship--a thousand times more democratic than any bourgeois democratic state--can focus the efforts of the society on the solution of the basic problems which determine its future and can rally these forces for work on the basis of a single plan in accordance with the objective requirements of the development of society and the interests of the people. Naturally, this required authoritative leading organs, accepted by society, able to block the activities of a variety of subversive elements. The new state was able to resolve such exceptionally complex problems, for it relied on a solid socioeconomic base--the alliance among the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia and all toiling strata, and on the unity among all nations and nationalities. The National Front--the reliable foundation of socialist democracy--was and remained the political expression of this class alliance in which the working class, headed by the communist party, played a hegemonistic role.

The strength of the new system made it possible to resolve most complex problems such as the industrialization of the country, rural collectivization, the cultural revolution and the extensive democratization of the educational system within an historically short time. The material and spiritual standards of the working people soon became incomparably higher. The new social system gave them confidence in the future, put an end to the age-old poverty of the masses, eliminated unemployment and difficulties caused by disease, old age and so on. Today, when socialism is beginning to develop on its own base, when the socialist principles in the foundation and the superstructure of society and in all areas of the integrated social organism are strengthening step by step, regardless of all difficulties, our society, its economy and all other areas of its life are developing dynamically. We can assess particularly well the results of the road to socialism covered by the people under the party's leadership. These successes fill us with legitimate pride and we shall allow no one to threaten, question or defame them. Nothing was given to us. Everything was paid for through persistent effort and each error cost us dearly.

We paid a particularly high price for forgetting the general laws governing the building of socialism and the Leninist principles confirmed by practical experience. The inability to apply such principles creatively, their inconsistent implementation, the satisfaction with their proclamation only and the indifference shown in their violation in practice, along with subjectivism and unrealistic planning, caused substantial harm. The accumulation of these errors and the unwillingness to eliminate them promptly, to analyze their reasons and, in accordance with the principles of Leninist policy, to draw the necessary conclusions for the elimination of shortcomings, involving some of a personnel nature, opened the way to the offensive of antisocialist forces against the socialist system in the 1960s. The result and the outcome are well known. The "Lessons From the Crisis Development in the Czechoslovak Communist Party and Society After the 13th CPCZ Congress" (December 1970) offer a profoundly self-critical study of

party activities during that period. This document not only provides an analysis but draws conclusions of topical significance to this day, as confirmed by the current development of circumstances throughout the world.

Unquestionably, the most important among them is the fact, frequently mentioned by Lenin, that as long as imperialism exists and as long as it finds any opportunity it will never abandon the hope for a capitalist restoration in countries where the working class is in power. It will always try to organize counterrevolutions and to destabilize the situation in such countries. It would be most naive to hope that imperialism will leave such countries alone or will even help them to build socialism.

In the 1960s the right-wing opportunists and revisionists fiercely attacked the idea of revolutionary vigilance, considering it a vestige of "dogmatism" which, actually, they ascribed to anything on which the successful process of revolutionary reorganization of our society was based. Gradually, their positions became ever more illogical. The more sympathy they showed for our class enemy (initially under the pretext of the need for a "dialog"), and the closer they allied themselves with them, the more allergic they became to anything Soviet, to the experience of the fraternal socialist countries and to Leninism (which was initially presented as "Stalinism"). It is natural, therefore, that when the counterrevolution began and when it was headed by opportunistic elements from the party's leadership, the out-and-out reactionaries in the West, anyone who previously rejected communism most virulently began to pay very great attention to and show sympathy for them explicitly. Thus, in his time, Dubcek was described as "the man of the year," and his picture, with the expression of a martyr, was frequently seen in all anticommunist publications. Everyone at that time was helping in the "rebirth" of socialism in Czechoslovakia! Even the Roman pope prayed for the success of this "rebirth."

The past 30 years of our development have unequivocally proved that as socialism becomes stronger, as it develops as an international system and as its influence on other countries rises the attempts of its opponents to eliminate or weaken socialism in one or another country become ever more refined. Whereas in the past imperialism was oriented toward the elimination of the socialist system by force, it gradually converted to more refined means of subversive activity. However well the enemies may conceal their plans behind methods such as the desire to "improve" socialism, "return it to its national origins," and to "regenerate" and make it more "democratic and humane," essentially they remain the same: one and the same attempts are always undertaken to undermine the roots of socialism, to weaken it and to hinder its forward movement throughout the world. All new efforts on the part of the adversaries to conceal their plans and to find new ways for the mounting of a counterrevolution, as was the case, for example, with the "sliding" counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia, merely prove the need to be vigilant. We must also realize that imperialism is relying on the more extensive and active use of revisionists and opportunists of all hues and of various "dissidents" and dissatisfied people in one socialist country or another.

This problem was mentioned by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 16th CPCZ Congress, reminding us that the most aggressive imperialist forces are energizing their activities aimed at undermining the unity of the socialist comity. "Under such circumstances," he said, "more than ever before our key to success lies in the

following: first, we must work ever better, more effectively and more organizedly, developing our economy, culture and socialist democracy. Secondly, we must always strengthen the unity among fraternal parties and their comprehensive and ever deeper cooperation in all areas; we must most efficiently rally our efforts and resources in the interests of each one of our countries and of the entire comity.... V. I. Lenin taught us how to assess our work soberly and critically. As long as the communists will follow his behest they can resolve any problem!"

Marxism-Leninism, our theory, is a creative and revolutionary doctrine which has nothing in common with dogmatism which is marked by a scornful attitude toward practical experience and the requirements of progress. Our successes are truly based on the critical evaluation of shortcomings, the active search for the best means for their elimination and planned concentration of forces on the solution of emerging problems. Whenever someone begins to conceal unpleasant facts and various shortcomings and to abandon the struggle for their elimination, and is thus forced to ignore their accumulation, at the same time he dooms himself to failure. If such a position is assumed by an individual the sad consequences affect only the people closest to him. However, should the party take this position, it would threaten the party itself and the entire society.

In the course of its 60-year history the CPCZ has followed a complex path of development. The victories achieved by the party along this path were based on a principle-minded Leninist policy, the experience of the CPSU, the other fraternal parties and the revolutionary workers movement, and inflexible loyalty to the revolutionary banner under which it was born.

What is the nature of revolutionism today and how is it reflected in contemporary party policy?

It means, above all, an awareness of the party's responsibility to the working class, the people of its country, the socialist comity, the international communist movement and all revolutionary and progressive anti-imperialist movements.

It means the adoption of a principled approach to the creative theory of K. Marx, F. Engels and V. I. Lenin, and the party's resolve and ability to apply this theory under contemporary conditions and, on its basis, to resolve topical current problems and to earmark a clear direction for the further development of society in building developed socialism in Czechoslovakia.

It means waging a decisive struggle for the conversion of our economy from extensive to intensive development, the conquest of new peaks in science, the putting of scientific achievements and the results of scientific and technical progress entirely in the service of the socialist society and on insuring a new upsurge in education, culture and art.

It means waging a continuing struggle for the shaping of the new man with a responsible attitude toward his job, family, society and the socialist fatherland, a man who considers socialist humanism and socialist ideology a matter of profound conviction and of theoretical and practical interpretation.

It also means that the party is fulfilling its own obligations with a feeling of the greatest possible responsibility: it is concerned with the steady ideological

and political growth of the party members; it fights for raising the standards of party ranks; it strengthens the workers nucleus on which it relies as the leading revolutionary detachment and as the true vanguard of the socialist society; it regulates the necessary age and national composition of the party; above all, it sees to it that every party member and candidate party member sets the example in the struggle for the implementation of its policy and wins new supporters and active fighters for the lofty communist ideals.

We are convinced that the recent 16th CPCZ Congress will become an important landmark on the revolutionary path of the party, and will make a new contribution to the strengthening and intensification of its leading role in our society, strengthen even further its influence and prestige and provide new powerful stimuli for its future activities.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

SIGNIFICANT DATE IN THE HISTORY OF THE ROMANIAN WORKERS MOVEMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 54-60

[Article by N. Aleksandrov]

[Text] In May the Romanian Communist Party will be celebrating its 60th anniversary.

The creation of the communist party was a legitimate result of the lengthy political, economic and ideological struggle waged by the Romanian proletariat, a struggle which broadened and intensified under the direct influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It marked the turning point in the evolution of the Romanian workers movement, a major victory for Marxism-Leninism over opportunism and reformism and the joining of the Third International by the RCP. Led by their communist party, the Romanian working people followed the glorious road of the struggle against capitalists and landowners, won the people's revolution and laid the foundations of the new system. Today they are successfully building a "comprehensively developed socialist society," as pointed out in the RCP documents.

Throughout this entire period, the CPSU has always been at the side of the RCP, giving the revolutionary vanguard of the Romanian working people all possible assistance. In turn, the Romanian communists have always supported the USSR.

The appearance of the first revolutionary circles in Romania may be traced to the 1870s. The ideas of scientific socialism began to spread somewhat later, and by 1893 the growth of the labor movement led to the appearance of the Social Democratic Party of Romanian Workers (SDPRW). Its leaders proclaimed their acceptance of the class struggle and of the Marxist positions. However, their practical activities were subject to a strong petit bourgeois influence and to the influence of the reformist dogmas of the opportunistic leaders of the Second International. The theory of "socialism in backward countries" became popular in this country with a small working class and a significant petit bourgeois stratum. According to this theory socialism was to come from the highly developed Western countries. Such concepts deprived the working class of revolutionary initiative and doomed it to a passive attitude. The predominance of opportunists and renegades in the leadership of the SDPRW brought about its breakdown in 1899.

The first Russian revolution greatly influenced the energizing and upsurge of the Romanian labor movement. A powerful peasant uprising broke out in the country in 1907. The ideological struggle between the two currents--the revolutionary and the reformist--within the Romanian social democratic movement became aggravated. The

revolutionary socialists, who were its left wing and who were the predecessors of the Romanian communists, were fighting for the victory of their line. The best representatives of the working class were working for the restoration of the party, finally accomplished in 1910. In their activities the leftists relied not only on their own experience but on the experience of the class struggle of the left-wing socialists in Bulgaria, the left-wing socialists in Serbia and, above all, the Russian revolutionaries.

The international ties between the Russian and Romanian revolutionary movements enjoyed long and firm traditions because of both the similarity in the fate of neighboring nations at different stages of historical development and the sympathy for Russia felt by the Romanian public. In 1877 Russia had assisted Romania in gaining its national independence in the struggle against the Turkish conquerors. We know of many manifestations of solidarity between the Russian and Romanian revolutionary movements. This includes direct ties among individual noted revolutionaries from both countries, the active participation of Romanian socialists in the shipment of Lenin's ISKRA, the mass response in Romania to the first Russian revolution and the fraternal aid given to the sailors from the "Potemkin."

Lenin's works most substantially influenced the development of revolutionary ties between Russia and Romania. V. I. Lenin's works were published in the Romanian labor press, acquainting the Romanian Social Democratic Party with the experience of the revolutionary movement in Russia and with the theoretical and tactical principles of the Bolshevik Party. They contributed to the proper orientation of the left wing of the Romanian social democrats and to its strengthening. In World War I, adopting Lenin's understanding of most important problems such as the attitude toward the imperialist war and the right of nations to self-determination, the Romanian leftists opposed the social chauvinists, who supported the policy of the bourgeoisie, and struggled for the ideology and policy of proletarian internationalism.

The Great October Socialist Revolution was enthusiastically welcomed by the Romanian workers and all working people. Through their strikes, meetings, demonstrations and publications in the workers press they expressed their solidarity with the first state of workers and peasants in the world. The December 1917 manifesto, which was published by a group of Romanian revolutionary socialists, stated: "Henceforth the fate of the world is linked to the victory of the proletariat. Today socialism rules one of the biggest countries in Europe; socialism is no longer a beautiful dream: it has won, it has triggered the fear of the reaction everywhere. Millions of proletarians, poor people and soldiers are celebrating the triumph of socialism." The victory of the Great October Revolution helped the Romanian proletariat and toiling peasantry to announce more firmly its demands for peace and for power to the workers.

The October Revolution had a decisive impact on the further assertion of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism in the Romanian labor movement. Between 1919 and 1921 "Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government," "The Infantile Disease of Left-Wing Communism," "Conditions for Membership in the Communist International," "Heroes of the Bern International" and other works by Lenin were published in Romania. The powerful influence of the vital experience of the October Revolution and Lenin's works contributed to the appearance of communist groups in the country. Such

groups appeared also among the Romanian revolutionaries living in Russia. Surmounting many difficulties, many Romanian internationalists returned to the homeland bringing the truth about our revolution and Lenin's words on the tasks of the proletariat. The participation of Romanian exiles, refugees and former prisoners of war in defending the gains of the October Revolution at the various civil war fronts was an outstanding page in the history of the international solidarity between the Romanian workers and peasants and the working people of the land of the soviets.

V. I. Lenin closely followed the development of revolutionary events in other countries. As early as the beginning of 1918 he noted that under the influence of the October Revolution the flames of the revolutionary struggle had moved to Romania (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 35, p 393). In November of the same year he pointed out that soviets of workers had begun to appear in Romania and Austria-Hungary under the influence of the October Revolution (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 37, p 203). Leaders of the Romanian workers movement repeatedly met with Lenin. Thus in 1920 he met with A. Dobrojanu, K. Popovich and G. Cristescu, members of the delegation of the Romanian Socialist Party attending the Second Comintern Congress. The leader of the world proletariat explained the position of the Bolshevik Party, discussed the most important problems of the international workers movement, emphasized the international significance of the Bolshevik experience and of the revolution in Russia and particularly concentrated on the prospects for the development of the left wing of the Romanian Socialist Party, the creation of a communist party and its affiliation with the Third International. Lenin's encounters with the Romanian socialists played a tremendous role in the ideological and organizational consolidation of the revolutionary current within the Romanian Socialist Party and in the struggle for the founding of a communist party.

The period of 1918-1920 was characterized in Romania by a tempestuous growth of the labor movement. The general strike of 1920 was a major action. However, it was defeated because of the position taken by the reformist leaders. The development of revolutionary events proved particularly emphatically the need for a Marxist-Leninist party and strengthened the left wing of the socialist movement, whose leaders included M. Bujor, A. Nikolau, and A. Constantinescu, and increased the resolve of the progressive workers to found a party of a new type.

The delegates to a clandestine conference of communist groups, held in November 1920, expressed themselves in favor of the immediate and unconditional affiliation with the Comintern and formed its own Central Committee within the Romanian Socialist Party, thus taking the first step to the organization of a revolutionary wing. A constituent congress was held, at which a communist party was founded and its affiliation with the Third International was proclaimed, on 8 May 1921. This was the result of the lengthy and tireless struggle waged by the left wing of the Romanian socialist movement against opportunism, reformism and centrism and for the principles of Leninism. At the very founding of the communist party the Romanian communists emphasized that they are linked with firm ties of international solidarity to the party of the great Lenin. In a special resolution the congress expressed "its profound admiration for the Russian proletariat, which is now the vanguard of the world proletariat in the struggle for liberation from the capitalist yoke."

The Romanian Communist Party raised the revolutionary movement in the country to a new level. Between 1922 and 1929 it organized numerous actions by metal, textile, printing and port workers and a big strike in Lupeni. However, the party was hardly able to become the true vanguard of the working people in the struggle for social liberation immediately. This was hindered by very strong vestiges of the social democratic legacy, the difficult circumstances of underground work and the fierce repression under which it was forced to operate. Furthermore, the right-wing centrist leaders of the socialist party, who were continuing their line of division of the workers movement, founded their own social democratic party. During the period of terror, when the communist party was declared outside the law and many party organizations were crushed, the Romanian working class and communists always felt the fraternal international support of the working people of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet communists.

The Fifth Romanian Communist Party Congress (1931) played an important role in party history. It drafted the party's strategic and tactical line, stipulating, in particular, that Romania was on the eve of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. The congress put an end to the factional struggle and took measures to insure the organizational strengthening of the party and to broaden its ties with the masses. In this work the Romanian communists were greatly helped by the Comintern Executive Committee, which especially discussed the situation with the Romanian Communist Party and, particularly, the nature of the future revolution in the country, in 1926. In connection with the aggravation of the international situation at the beginning of the 1930s, the Fifth RCP Congress emphasized that "War against the USSR....would also mean a merciless war against the toiling masses in Romania itself" and that "The party will be able to mobilize the broadest possible masses in the struggle against this threat only when it explains to these masses that by defending the USSR they are defending themselves and their daily, vital and historical interests."

During the global economic crisis of the 1930s, the broad people's masses, headed by the Romanian working class, mounted major social battles against the offensive of capitalism and the foreign monopolies. The ferment among the peasantry and the other strata increased. The actions of the Grivica railroad workers in Bucharest and of the petroleum workers of Dolina Prahova in 1933 proved the increasing role and power of the Romanian proletariat. Its activities were headed by G. Gheorhiu-Dej, S. Kivu, I. Pintilie and other firm revolutionaries.

The struggle waged by the Romanian working people met with a warm response in the USSR. Thus, in 1933 the Soviet people raised their powerful voice in protest against the reprisals launched by the ruling circles of bourgeois-landowning Romania against the leaders of the great battles waged by the Grivica railroad workers. Many protest meetings were held in Moscow, Leningrad and many other Soviet cities.

In turn, the Romanian communists, who ascribed great importance to strengthening international solidarity with the Soviet people, extensively propagandized the outstanding achievements of the first socialist country and asked for the establishment of diplomatic relations between Romania and the Soviet Union. In 1934 the ruling circles of monarchic Romania were forced to establish such relations without, however, changing their overall anti-Soviet political line. It was then that the Friends of the USSR Association was formed.

In its struggle against the bourgeois offensive against the living standard of the working people and the increased threat of fascism and war, and using the tactic of the single workers and popular front tactic, formulated at the Seventh Comintern Congress, the Romanian Communist Party worked for the founding of a single General Federation of Labor, which would put an end to the division within the trade union movement. The Democratic Bloc, which was created on its initiative, won the parliamentary elections in 1936 and 1937 in a number of cities. The party concluded an agreement for joint action with the Agrarian Front, the democratic organization of the peasants, MADOS, the alliance of Hungarian working people in Romania, and the left-wing socialists.

In subsequent years the reactionary offensive in the areas of economic and political life and the restriction of bourgeois democracy, civil rights and freedoms intensified. The Romanian ruling circles pursued an anti-Soviet and profoundly antinational policy. They betrayed the interests of the people and subordinated the country to the rule of Hitlerite Germany. The Romanian working class, headed by the communist party, opposed this policy. However, although hindering it, the antifascist struggle did not stop the fascist process in Romania. A royal dictatorial regime was established in the country followed (in 1914) by the military fascist Antonescu dictatorship. Monarchic Romania was made into a full satellite of Hitlerite Germany and became involved in the criminal war against the Soviet Union.

The Romanian communists continued their struggle in the difficult circumstances created by the rule of Antonescu's clique. In assuming the leadership of the antifascist movement, from the very first days of the war the RCP called upon the people's masses to struggle for Romania's withdrawal from the war on the side of Hitlerite Germany to join the Soviet Union and the anti-Hitlerite coalition, overthrowing the fascist regime and setting up a government of national independence. The Romanian communists organized numerous sabotage and diversionary activities, set up armed patriotic detachments and disseminated proclamations and appeals. In 1943 the communist party was able to rally the antifascist forces within the Patriotic Anti-Hitlerite Front. In 1944 it succeeded in forming the United Workers Front and signing an agreement with the national peasant and national liberal parties for the organization of the National Democratic Bloc.

The Hitlerite bloc began to break down under the crushing blows of the Soviet Army in 1944. The big success achieved by the Soviet forces in the south of the Ukraine and their penetration into Romanian territory by the end of March changed the circumstances in the Balkans radically. The Iasi-Kishinev operation, in the course of which a big concentration of enemy forces was defeated and the Hitlerite command and the Antonescu clique were deprived of their armed support, was of decisive importance. In carrying out its universal-historical mission of liberating the enslaved peoples of Europe from the fascist yoke the Soviet Army mounted a headlong offensive within Romania. Under these favorable external conditions, led by the communists, the Romanian people overthrew the fascist regime and had a victorious armed uprising on 23 August 1944.

The landmarks in the development of the people's democratic revolution were the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, Romania's conversion to the camp of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, the formation of a government of the National Democratic Front in March 1945, the elimination of a final reactionary bulwark, the monarchy,

and the proclamation of the Romanian People's Republic in 1947. The establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat in Romania in a relatively peaceful way and the conversion to the implementation of the tasks of the socialist revolution became possible as a result of the decisive actions taken by the people's masses under the leadership of the RCP, the comprehensive aid of the Soviet Union and the increased forces of democracy and socialism throughout the world. In 1945 the USSR resumed diplomatic relations with Romania. In 1947 it helped it to neutralize Western attempts to impose upon it a harsh peace treaty, as a result of which its international position was strengthened and Romania was able to take its place in the broad world arena. Economic cooperation with the USSR and substantial Soviet material aid to Romania in the initial postwar years helped the Romanian people rapidly to overcome economic difficulties, to stabilize the economic life of the country and to strengthen the people's democratic regime.

The founding of the united party of the Romanian working class in 1948, as a result of the merger between the communist and social democratic parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, put an end to the division in the Romanian labor movement and strengthened its vanguard role in the struggle for socialism.

In the course of the building of socialism, led by the party and creatively applying the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the experience of Lenin's party, the Romanian working people carried out deep socioeconomic changes. Romania surmounted the economic backwardness inherited from the bourgeois landowning system and became a socialist country with developed industry, cooperated agriculture and progressive science and culture. The Ninth RCP Congress (1965) noted the total victory of socialist production relations in town and country. The constitution, which was passed that same year, codified the new name of the state--the Socialist Republic of Romania. Conditions were created in the country for moving on to the stage of building a developed socialist society. The tasks of this stage were expressed in the RCP program and in other documents adopted at the party's 11th (1974) and 12th (1979) congresses.

Radical structural changes occurred in the Romanian economy. Industry became the basic economic sector, accounting for more than 60 percent of the national income (as against 30.8 percent in 1938). Priority was given to the development of the power industry, metallurgy, machine building and the chemical industry. Today's Romanian industrial output is higher than during the prewar period by a factor of 48 while its national income has risen by a factor of 14. The appearance of the Romanian village has changed.

Today the efforts of the Romanian people are focused on the implementation of the decisions of the 12th RCP Congress. Particular attention is being paid to raising production effectiveness and intensification, the rational deployment of production forces, improvement of production relations, education of the new man and upgrading of the material and cultural standards of the working people.

The party has more than three million members. It is always concerned with improving its leading role in all realms of the building of socialism. It pays great attention to improving the activities of the state and its central and local organs, developing socialist democracy and involving the working people in the administration of production and social affairs.

The experience in building a new society on Romanian soil proved the accuracy of the basic Marxist-Leninist laws of transition from capitalism to socialism: the need for a proletarian dictatorship, the leading role of the communist party, the country's industrialization, agricultural collectivization, and the cultural revolution. The RCP program stipulates that it "earmarks the means for the creative application of these laws under the specific historical, social and national conditions of Romania." The achievements of the Romanian working people convincingly prove that socialism offers a nation extensive opportunities for the growth of its production forces and for progress in all areas of life. At the same time, they confirm the fruitfulness of the cooperation between socialist countries and their comradely mutual aid.

The CPSU ascribes great importance to the development and the strengthening of friendship and cooperation with the RCP. Relations between our parties and peoples rest on the solid foundation of a common social system, Marxist-Leninist ideology, unity of long-term objectives and tasks and the common defense of the revolutionary gains of our peoples from imperialist encroachments. Soviet-Romanian relations are based on the 7 July 1970 Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Aid Treaty, on the basis of total equality and respect for the sovereignty and autonomy of the two countries. They are part of the interrelated socialist countries within CEMA and the Warsaw Pact, which insure reliably the free development of socialist countries and their successes in the building of a new society.

Relations between the CPSU and the RCP are a leading feature in the cooperation between the USSR and the Socialist Republic of Romania. Annual plans for the exchange of delegations for the reciprocal study of practical experience are being successfully fulfilled. Contacts are maintained between party establishments and educational institutions and party press organs in the two countries. Local party organs are in contact with each other. Party, soviet and public organizations of many USSR oblasts, cities and rayons maintain friendly contacts with Romanian districts and cities. The leaders of the two parties meet for consultations. Summit meetings between Comrades L. I. Brezhnev and N. Ceausescu are particularly important in terms of Soviet-Romanian relations.

Bilateral economic cooperation is developing in accordance with the plans. The USSR plays a leading role in Romanian foreign trade. It supplies Romania with machines and equipment, many varieties of raw materials and technical documentation in exchange for which it receives a variety of items produced by the machine building, chemical, light and food industries. The national economic plans of our countries have been coordinated in 1981-1985 and a long-term program for the development of production specialization between the USSR and the Socialist Republic of Romania for the period through 1990 has been concluded. These documents call for the further development of bilateral mutually profitable economic relations. In his speech at the 26th CPSU Congress Comrade N. Ceausescu emphasized that "The further and even greater development of Romanian-Soviet friendship, cooperation and solidarity will serve the progress and prosperity of the peoples of both countries and the cause of socialism and peace the world over."

The Soviet Union and the members of the socialist comity, including the Socialist Republic of Romania, are engaged in an adamant struggle for strengthening peace,

eliminating the threat of war and preserving and strengthening detente. The program of measures aimed at strengthening peace formulated by the political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact members at its Bucharest, Moscow and Warsaw sessions is well known.

The foreign policy line of the socialist countries, clearly expressed in the peace program drafted at the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses, was organically extended and developed at the 26th congress. The program of measures for strengthening peace, intensifying detente and restraining the arms race formulated in the party's Central Committee accountability report, submitted by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and unanimously approved by the congress, met with a broad response throughout the world, including Romania. The March 1981 CC RPC Plenum noted that the Soviet proposals "opened possibilities of initiating talks and seeking means for ending the arms race and undertaking the solution of problems through talks. That is why we support these suggestions and are making great efforts to contribute to disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament."

In marking the 60th anniversary of the founding of the RCP, the Soviet poeple are sincerely pleased with the successes achieved by the Romanian people under the leadership of the communist party in resolving the problems of building a developed socialist society. They are confident that the international solidarity and cooperation between the Soviet and Romanian communists and between our peoples will continue to broaden and intensify on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian and socialist internationalism.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

LESSONS OF THE PAST AND CONCERNS OF THE PRESENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 61-75

[Article by Lt Gen P. Zhilin, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the outbreak of the Great Patriotic War]

[Text] I

Forty years have passed since that memorable Sunday of 22 June 1941 when the fiery storm of the war erupted. The hordes of Hitlerite Germany treacherously invaded the territory of the Soviet Union. The thunder of enemy airplanes, the clanking of tank treads and the thunder of exploding shells and bombs violated the peaceful toil of the Soviet people. The Great Patriotic War began. It lasted four long years, culminating in the shining universal-historical victory of the Soviet people over fascism.

The war is now history. However, it is an unforgettable history. This is understandable, for it forced a sharp change in the entire life of the country, swallowed in its flames millions of lives and brought our society tremendous destruction, suffering and sadness which are still sharply and sorrowfully alarming the people's memory. At the same time, however, it left in the memory of the people a deep feeling of pride in their socialist homeland.

In unleashing the war against the Soviet Union, the shock force of international imperialism--German fascism--pursued the far-reaching objective of ending the war against the Soviet Union in a "lightning" campaign and opening for itself a route to global domination.

World War II, of which the Great Patriotic War was the most important component, involved in its orbit more than three-fourths of the population of the earth. It was the bloodiest and most destructive of all wars. The main burden of opposition to fascist aggression fell on the Soviet people. More than 70 percent of all German armed forces were concentrated on the Soviet-German front. The center of the armed struggle shifted here and it was here that the biggest battles took place, battles which radically changed the course of World War II. It was precisely here that the dawn of victory over fascism rose and that its triumph was achieved.

United with the communist party, the Soviet Union and its people and armed forces were the power which had a decisive impact on the entire course and outcome of

World War II. If we singled out the most outstanding feats of the war we would note the three main problems resolved by the land of the soviets: the Soviet Union and its armed forces blocked the path of fascist aggression, i.e., resolved a problem which no single Western country was able to resolve; in the course of fierce battles they eliminated the bulk of the enemy's forces and military equipment, i.e., they deprived it of its main component--the means of warfare; they completed the defeat of the fascist-military aggressors by providing direct aid to the peoples of Europe and Asia by rescuing them from slavery and physical annihilation.

Through their selfless struggle the Soviet armed forces achieved a radical transformation in World War II and considerably speeded up its conclusion, thus saving millions of people from death in many countries and preserving their towns and villages from destruction. In the course of the war against fascist Germany the USSR not only resolved national problems but fulfilled a noble international mission of liberation. That is why the victory of the Soviet Union was of tremendous international significance.

The historical victory won by the Soviet people in the war confirmed yet again that there are no forces in the world able to halt the legitimate progress of socialism and communism. It proved the advantages of socialist political and governmental systems compared with capitalist. The war proved the greatness of spirit of the Soviet people and their infinite loyalty to the cause of their Leninist party, under whose leadership the forces of the most frantic imperialist reaction and medieval obscurantism were defeated. Socialism proved convincingly, once again, that it is the most reliable bulwark of the cause of peace, democracy and social progress.

The resistance movement, which spread widely in the countries occupied by the aggressors, played an important role in the struggle for victory. The fearless actions of the partisan units and the heroism of the national liberation forces will be forever part of the history of the antifascist struggle. In the difficult war years the communist and workers' parties were in the vanguard of the struggle against the most dangerous enemies of mankind--fascism and militarism.

The peoples and armies of the members of the anti-Hitlerite coalition made a major contribution to the common victory over the enemy. The possibility of political and military cooperation among countries with different social systems was confirmed through practical actions.

The history of the Great Patriotic War is permeated with dramatic events and with the heroic acts of millions of people which have preserved their unabated power of attraction even now, 40 years after its outbreak and 36 years after its end. The results and experience of the gigantic confrontation of the last war are totally unparalleled and never before have military events of the past had such a powerful impact on subsequent sociopolitical processes. "The defeat of Hitlerite Germany," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out, "marked the victory of progress over reaction, humanism over barbarism, and of socialism over imperialist obscurantism. This victory opened the door to the upsurge of the revolutionary struggle of the working class, the unparalleled development of the national liberation movement and the breakdown of the shameful colonial system."

A number of ties link the history of the Great Patriotic War and its results to our present. This is explained above all by the tremendous response which the victory of the Soviet Union over fascist Germany had throughout the world, the unquestionable international prestige which our country and the heroic Soviet people earned among the broad population strata on earth. Winston Churchill was forced to acknowledge that "In the struggle against Hitler the peoples of Russia earned tremendous good will in the West, most of all in the United States." The farther back the difficult war years retreat into the past, the more comprehensively and vividly the decisive contribution made by the Soviet Union to the defeat of Hitlerism appears in the eyes of the world.

It is useful in our restless times to turn more frequently to history and its lessons, to study them more profoundly and to draw proper conclusions for the present. This is necessary mainly in order to prevent the outbreak of another world conflagration and to block the error of the past--the underestimating of the danger of war--and the timely blocking of its path. A war situation ripens long before the bombs begin to explode. It has its own concealed "embryonic" period. Such was the case in the past and such may be the case in the present unless, as V. I. Lenin pointed out, we explain to the people "the real circumstances of the great secret in which a war is mounted," and decisively expose the "sophistries which justify war" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 45, pp 318-319), and unless effective antiwar measures are taken.

In implementing the social instructions of its class, bourgeois reactionary historiography is trying to falsify and conceal from the people the insurmountable fact that World War II was created by the imperialist system which was preparing itself for a new redivision of the world, and that it was unleashed with the main purpose of destroying the Soviet state, its sociopolitical system and its communist ideology.

A task which is, to this day, of major scientific and ideological significance is to show to the people's masses the true reasons for the outbreak of the war and expose its real culprits. This helps the communist and workers' parties and all progressive forces in their struggle for the prevention of a new world war. It supplies them with valuable material for exposing the aggressive policy of imperialism and helps them to resolve the main problem of our time--the preservation of peace. This is necessary also for the sake of exposing the links between the forces of aggression of the past and the enemies of detente today, forces which are causing tremendous harm to the cause of peace and the interests of all nations.

Peace--war. Two words. However, how broad the gap dividing them is. What disparate and incompatible phenomena they represent.

"To defend the peace," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th party congress, "is the most important international task for our party, the people and all nations on the planet today." With this statement the CPSU reasserted the Soviet peace strategy. It is to precisely this policy of peace that the people of goodwill on all continents link their hopes for the future.

Such is the precise and clear position of our party. This is the essence of the foreign political doctrine of the Soviet state. At the 26th congress it was firmly supported by the president of the Academy of Sciences and a noted miner in the Donbass, a weaver at the Ivanovo Combine and a teacher from Kostromskaya Oblast. Emotional and lofty words on peace were heard in the speeches of the delegates.

However, there is also another word--"war"--which, in the minds of our people, invokes so much bitterness, blood and suffering. War in its new, its nuclear variant, creates in all people of goodwill extreme concern for the fate of the world and civilization.

As in the prewar years, imperialism as a system and its leaders, the rulers of imperialism, who are losing their leading role in the world and are trying to regain it by all possible means, military in particular, are the spokesmen and promoters of the militant line. This is mainly the goal of the U. S. imperialists and the aggressive NATO circles which consider war the only means for the solution of global problems, above all that of the struggle against socialism and the tempestuously developing revolutionary movement, which affects the capitalist countries as well. Imperialism seeks an outcome from the intensifying crisis and the historical impasse in which it has found itself in war.

Such are the two diametrically opposite policies and strategies. It is precisely on them that an acute ideological struggle, which is becoming increasingly complex and assuming new aspects, is focused.

The bourgeois reactionary politicians extensively employ the falsification of the history of World War II for their own ideological purposes. They have become particularly energized in connection with the 40th anniversary of the outbreak of the war and are intensifying their efforts today, on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the Wehrmacht's invasion of USSR territory.

Insane concepts of the need for another world war are being disseminated among foreign circles hostile to us which consider the scientific aspect of the matter secondary. They support their ideas with questionable forays into history. For example, bourgeois sociologists claim that world wars break out as the result of definite cyclical laws and mathematical progressions each 10, 20 or 30 years. They think as follows: after the 1904–1905 Russo-Japanese war which, allegedly, was a global war, the first world war broke out 10 years later, in 1914; World War II broke out in 1939, 20 years later. More than 35 years have passed since, which makes the supporters of a new war impatient. The Beijing politicians proclaim that "War is inevitable, for each generation must have its war," and "War can be fought only with war." Since such is the case, Deng Xiaoping states, war must be encouraged. The same idea is adamantly preached by the American General A. Haig, the present U. S. secretary of state. "Some things are more important than peace," he has proclaimed. He has categorically stated that "Americans must be willing to fight."

Thanks to the active foreign policy of the USSR and the other socialist countries and the efforts of all progressive forces on the planet, mankind has lived without a world war for 36 years. However, the propagandists of war consider mathematical computations far more important than the laws of our time and the vital interests of the peoples.

Imperialism's military preparations have long exceeded the area of theoretical considerations. They have shifted to the material and ideological, psychological in particular, areas.

The ideological factor plays an exceptionally important role in war. M. A. Sholokhov accurately stated that "not simply nations, armies, soldiers and generals go to war. Ideas go into battle. The superiority and spiritual maturity of the Soviet soldier were unquestionable even during the most difficult initial days of the war." These qualities--lofty and noble feelings of Soviet patriotism, ideological firmness and infinite loyalty to their homeland--were carried by the Soviet people from the Brest fortress to the Brandenburg gates.

Actually, the very first imperialist crusade against the Soviet republic was launched for the sake of suppressing the socialist revolution. Let us recall the words of Churchill, the organizer of the campaign: "The child must be strangled in its cradle." The same idea was concocted by Hitler in organizing his campaign against the Soviet Union in 1941. In a speech to the generals, in which he expressed his political credo, he stated that, "The war against Russia is a struggle between two ideologies. In the war against Russia it is a question of a struggle for destruction. Unless we look at it this way, although we may defeat the enemy, 30 years later the communist danger will arise once again."

It was precisely this monstrous anti-Soviet formula that was the basis of that official but thoroughly false document, the Ribbentrop memorandum, which was delivered to our ambassador to Berlin at 4:00 am on 22 June 1941, when the fascist hordes were already treacherously attacking the Soviet Union along its entire western border from the land, the sea and the air. The purpose of this memorandum, which detailed the reasons for Germany's "preventive" war against the Soviet Union, was to substantiate ideologically the account fabricated by Hitlerite propaganda according to which Soviet foreign policy was a policy of constant military threat and expansion.

Today's aggressive forces, which are increasing international tension and preparing a new global slaughter, are following Hitler's and Goebbels' footsteps. They give priority to the ideological preparations for war, which they carry out on a tremendous scale. As early as the 24th CPSU Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said that "We are living under conditions of an unabated ideological warfare waged against our country and the socialist world by imperialist propaganda, which is using most refined ways and powerful technical means."

The bourgeoisie has gained extensive experience in ideological warfare. It is coordinating its efforts toward the development of ways and means for the mounting of anticommunist actions. Not so long ago the American diplomat E. Reischauer stated that "Since the military lever of anticommunist policy is limited in scale, while the economic one is slow and ineffectual, we must turn to the third strategic weapon--the ideological."

This statement is extremely clear. The directions of bourgeois propaganda are numerous and varied. Let us single out the main ones.

The first is to undermine, to defame the theoretical foundations of socialism--Marxism-Leninism--and to revise and replace it, with revisionist help, with new

"models," to emasculate the class, proletarian and internationalist nature of this doctrine, to divide the socialist countries, to pit them against each other, to trigger the internal "erosion" of the new system and to pit nationalism against internationalism.

The second is to misrepresent and distort the experience and achievements of the building of socialism in the USSR, including the military defense of socialism, mainly during the Great Patriotic War, the initiator of the tremendous international prestige of our country.

Lies, slanders, misrepresentations, ideological subversions and many other means are being used extensively for such purposes.

II

Bourgeois propaganda has mobilized its ideological resources in the struggle against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Reactionary historiography is actively participating in this struggle, frenziedly preaching anticommunism and anti-Sovietism. It is generally subsidized by governmental organs and monopoly foundations. It is given extensive opportunities for the publication of books and articles and the use of radio, television and other mass information media.

As regards military history, the efforts of Western historiography are focused on the main problems which are closely related to the contemporary situation in the world. It concentrates above all on the experience of World War II--the greatest military clash in the history of mankind.

The imperialist ideologues believe that the new generation developed in the postwar period is showing an exceptional interest in the last war. Based on the results of a public opinion survey in the United States, THE NEW YORK TIMES pointed out that today no event of the past seems "so captivating, heroic and hellishly interesting as World War II" to the simple Americans. The young people would like to know more about what is known in the United States as "grandfather's war." No other war has triggered in the West such an abundance of publications as the history of World War II. Series of books of 60, 80 or even 100 volumes each have been published in the United States, the FRG and Japan. The number of such publications is not declining. A series of 20 volumes published by the "Time-Life Books" publishing house confirms the growing interest of readers in this topic. This publication drew 780,000 subscribers.

However, it is not merely the fact that the imperialist ideologues are taking into consideration the interest and desire of the readership to become familiar with the past, but the fact that, day after day, they are offering a suitably falsified history of World War II. An American publishing house was interested in publishing in English the 12-volume, "History of World War II 1939-1945," the publication of which is nearing its end in our country, and asked the Soviet side not to obstruct its plan. After the Soviet agreement, White House officials banned the publication. The case of the 20-episode documentary motion picture "The Great Patriotic War" ("The Unknown War") was almost identical. When the first episodes began to appear on television in the United States, those who control mass information

media in America were frightened by the truth about the Soviet Union, its people and its armed forces and allowed the film to be shown in episodes, addressing it to school audiences and, later removing it from the air.

As to knowledge of the true history of the Great Patriotic War and the significance of its biggest battles and their results, the topic remains "unknown," as it were, to many Americans.

The American bourgeois authors blatantly distort the truth of the Great Patriotic War and the Soviet Armed Forces. They are trying to misrepresent events on the Soviet-German front and to conceal the great victories of the Soviet Army.

Recently the USSR Ministry of Defense Institute of Military History received the following letter from the United States: "Allow me to introduce myself. I am a graduate student in the department of history at the University of Southern Illinois and am currently writing my dissertation. My topic is the Kursk battle. My point of view, supported by many scientists, is that this battle was a major turning point in World War II. I believe that it was precisely the Soviet-German war of 1941-1945 that led to the defeat of the German forces. However, many of my American colleagues still fail to appreciate the contribution of the Soviet Union to the final defeat of the fascist hordes."

If such deliberately distorted versions are being spread among historians, should we be surprised that, asked, "What is Stalingrad?" only one of a group of young Americans answered that something important had taken place in Stalingrad during the war but that he did not know exactly what.

How could he, if so far no single book by a Soviet author on the history of the Great Patriotic War has been published in the United States? Access to Soviet literature on such problems is totally blocked there.

The falsifiers of history in the United States, Britain and the FRG are trying to mold a false public opinion on the defeat of Hitlerite Germany and its satellites, conceal the responsibility of international imperialism for the outbreak of the war and hide the indivisible ties linking aggressive forces--monopolies, fascism and militarism. They are trying to undermine the international prestige of the Soviet Union, create a negative attitude toward its foreign political actions, promote mistrust among the members of the socialist comity and exert ideological influence on politically unstable people in many countries, including the socialist.

Shamelessly repeating the lies and slanders of Goebbels' propaganda, first the falsifiers of history ascribe to the Soviet government an "interest" in unleashing World War II, with a view to the spreading of socialism to other countries; secondly, they accuse the Soviet Union of "aggressive intentions" toward neighboring and other countries. On the basis of such fabrications they are trying to justify the "preventive" nature of the attack launched by fascist Germany against the USSR. Reactionary American historians such as S. Possony and J. Baker, "Sovietologist" L. Fischer and many others write about the fictitious aspirations of the Soviet Union to trigger a war between the hostile groups. The author of an

article published in MILITARY REVIEW, a military journal, states on the basis of historical analogies that the Soviet Union is willing "to assume a major risk for the sake of achieving polical objectives," and is trying "to insure the blossoming of communism throughout the world with the help of a decisive strike" (MILITARY REVIEW, October 1980, p 25).

By spreading such slanderous assertions, which grossly distort historical truth and have no scientific substantiation whatever, the reactionary historians are trying to rehabilitate the policy of the imperialist countries which prepared and unleashed World War II.

In order to discredit Soviet prewar foreign policy, reactionary historians are describing the Soviet Union as being just as "expansionistic" as fascist Germany. For example, W. Rutherford, a British publicist, writes that allegedly the USSR pursued even "more expansionistic" objectives than Hitlerite Germany (W. Rutherford. "Hitler's Propaganda Machine." New York, 1978, p 54).

All this is an obvious lie; such "historians" are naturally aiming at something bigger. Thus, writing in the journal MILITARY REVIEW, the American Col J. Haggery equates the seizure of Austria and Czechoslovakia by the Hitlerites, as events which directly preceded the outbreak of World War II, with the introduction of a limited contingent of Soviet forces into Afghanistan, in meeting the request of the government of that country in connection with the direct threat of foreign intervention, entirely in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and the 1978 Soviet-Afghan Treaty. He then proceeds to ask rhetorically: "Have we heard the first shot of World War III with the invasion of the Russians into Afghanistan?" (MILITARY REVIEW, August 1980, p 38). He is thus trying to depict the Soviet Union as the "instigator" of a new war and, by the same token, ideologically to conceal the expansionism of the United States and its allies. "The monopolies need foreign petroleum, uranium and nonferrous metals," the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th congress noted, "and the United States is proclaiming the Middle East, Africa and the Indian Ocean a sphere of "vital interests." The U. S. military machinery is actively making its way in these areas, preparing for a long stay. Diego Garcia Island in the Indian Ocean, Oman, Kenya, Somalia and Egypt, what more? In order to share expenses with others and tie more strongly to itself its NATO partners, the United States is trying to broaden the functions of this bloc. The strategists in Washington would clearly like to involve in their military preparations dozens of other countries, and to cover the world with the spiderweb of its bases, airfields and arms depots."

Imperialist propaganda uses for anti-Soviet purposes the 1939 Soviet-German non-aggression treaty, presenting it as a "most important event" which, allegedly, made "war in Europe inevitable" (M. McCauley (editor). "Communist Power in Europe 1944-1949." New York, 1977, p IX). The authors supporting this thesis do not burden themselves with finding an answer to the question of why the USSR was forced to sign this treaty. The historical truth is: the Soviet government and the communist party were the supporters of collective security. They were fully resolved to block the path of fascist aggression and tried to do this by all possible means. At the meetings of the military missions of the USSR, Britain and France, held on Soviet initiative in Moscow between 12 and 21 August 1939, i.e., two weeks before the outbreak of World War II, it was precisely the Soviet Union

which definitively called for the conclusion of an Anglo-Franco-Soviet military treaty for joint effort against Hitlerite aggression. The USSR was prepared to commit tremendous forces, totaling 120 infantry and 16 cavalry divisions. However, neither Britain nor France was willing to sign a military agreement with the Soviet Union with a view to restraining the aggressor and preventing the outbreak of World War II.

There is yet another noteworthy circumstance: despite Soviet publication of documents and minutes on this topic, they are totally ignored by bourgeois historiography.

Why did Britain and France refuse this agreement? Because the bourgeois reactionary governments of these countries, the "Munich people," did not want a military alliance with the Soviet state but tried to encourage Hitler to wage war on the USSR. In assessing the circumstances of the talks, A. Taylor, the noted British historian, wrote that, "The British rejected the suggestion with horror: they considered inconceivable a war in which they would fight on the side of Soviet Russia against Germany." Lloyd George, then British prime minister, said: "Mr Neville Chamberlain, Lord Halifax and Sir Simon wish no alliance with Russia." As early as 1939 the British and French governments wanted to put the USSR in a state of double jeopardy: threatened on the west by fascist Germany and on the east by militaristic Japan. However, this does not interest the falsifiers of history in the least. They do not think of the alternative, had the USSR failed to conclude a nonaggression pact with Germany at that time.

It was not the Soviet-German nonaggression pact, which was a forced action at an exceptionally difficult period for our country, on the eve of World War II, and which gave the Soviet Union an additional 20 months to strengthen its defense power, but the failure of the Moscow talks with Britain and France, a failure supported by the United States, that led to the fact that the fascist aggression could no longer be prevented.

The reactionary historians do not limit themselves to such accusations addressed to the Soviet Union. By the end of December 1979, when imperialist propaganda mounted a malicious anti-Soviet campaign in connection with the introduction of a limited contingent of Soviet forces in Afghanistan, the Western press carried "scientific" articles in which the Soviet Union was ascribed "aggressive aspirations of long standing" toward Near and Middle Eastern countries. Thus, in its 30 December 1979 issue THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote that in November 1940, during the Soviet-German talks in Berlin, the Soviet government had allegedly insisted on extending its influence over the area of the Bosphorus, the Dardanelles and the Indian Ocean. Such arbitrary claims have been frequently exposed in Soviet historical publications, particularly in the basic work "Istoriya Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny 1939-1945 Gg." [History of World War II 1939-1945] (Voyenizdat, Moscow, Vol 3, 1974). Indeed, in November 1940 Hitler insisted on meeting high Soviet officials. This task was assigned to V. M. Molotov. The talks took place in Berlin on 12-13 November. The German diplomats suggested that the Soviet Union conclude an agreement with the Axis powers, engage in "political cooperation" with them and subscribe to a declaration which stipulated that the territorial aspirations of the Soviet Union would be directed south of its state borders, toward the Indian

Ocean. Naturally, the USSR government categorically rejected this absurd suggestion. Subsequently, W. Churchill, for example, was to note that "as was expected, the Soviet government rejected the German plan." The talks ended inconclusively.

Marshal of the Soviet Union A. M. Vasilevskiy, who was a member of the general staff at that time and who was an adviser to the delegation, recalled that "Returning from Germany, we exchanged impressions of the trip. Our mood was sad, depressed from the meetings with the German governmental circles and the talks with the personnel of our embassy and the staff of the military attache. All of us were convinced that Hitler was nursing a grievance and that he intended to attack us, sooner or later."

As to fabrications concerning the "Soviet aspirations in the direction of the Persian Gulf," despite their groundlessness, they are being whipped up ever more persistently by those whose naval armada is plying its waters. Thus, an article by B. Hann, published in the January 1980 issue of the American weekly THE NATIONAL REVIEW, claims that as early as 1918 Soviet Russia was trying to penetrate into India and considered Iran "the first country to be conquered."

Yet is it not known that at that time Soviet Russia was surrounded by a deadly ring of fronts, that it was repelling the attacks of the forces of the Western interventionists and the White Guards, and that as early as February 1921 it had concluded its first equal treaty with an Eastern country, namely Persia, openly proclaiming the abrogation of all uneven treaties and agreements concluded by the tsarist government with the great powers to the detriment of Persia? The British journal THE NATION noted in June 1921 that in the case of Persia, Russia "had annulled everything such as concessions, roads, telegraphs and banks, without asking a single pence in damages." Should we also mention the fact that it was precisely a Western power, England, that was the total colonial master of India in 1918? The logic of some American press organs is a strange one!

In order to make their slander convincing the bourgeois scribblers have also used a forgery such as the purported testament of Peter the Great, in which allegedly the Russian emperor asked that "the Russian people be kept in a state of continuous war" and systematically "engage in conquests" in all directions, including the direction of Iran. This forgery was exposed as early as the 19th century. It has been entirely refuted also in the works of Soviet researchers (see VOPROSY ISTORII, No 2, 1979). Nevertheless, it is being shamelessly used to this day. Thus, at the international congress of historians, held in Bucharest in August 1980, Western anti-Soviet tourists came to the congress and tried to distribute this "document" among the delegates.

The bourgeois and Beijing falsifiers are resorting to the distortion of military history with a view to generating mistrust between the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity and creating in the peoples of these countries a negative and, possibly, hostile attitude toward the USSR. In connection with the Polish events imperialist propaganda is making particular efforts to energize antisocialist and nationalist elements in that country.

For example, the authors of the recently published second volume of the offical West German work "Das Deutsche Reich und der Zweite Weltkrieg" (The German Reich

and World War II, Vol 2, Stuttgart, 1979) write not about the German but the "German-Soviet attack on Poland" in September 1939. They treat the liberation of the fraternal peoples of Western Belorussia and Western Ukraine as a "Soviet annexation," and equate the piratical attack of fascist Germany against Poland, which led to the loss of Polish national independence and resulted in World War II, with the liberation campaign of the Soviet Army on a territory taken by force from Soviet Russia and which, by then, was facing the unavoidable danger of Hitlerite occupation.

Today's Polish reactionary and counterrevolutionary circles support the version of Western reactionary historiography. These forces and their KOSKOR inspirers require a revision of history, the history of Russian-Polish and Soviet-Polish relations above all. For example, they interpret the 1830-1839 Polish uprising, which also spread to areas ruled by tsarist Russia, not as an act against autocracy but as an anti-Russian event; the interpretation given to the Polish-Soviet war of 1920, which broke out as a result of the intervention by bourgeois-landowning Poland against the Soviet republic, is clearly anti-Soviet; the Soviet-German pact of 1939 is described as an agreement for the "fourth division of Poland." This is being said about our country which not only guaranteed the restoration of the independent Polish state but insured its liberation from the brown plague with the blood of our sons and daughters. "We shall never forget," said Stanislaw Kania, PZPR Central Committee first secretary, at the 26th CPSU Congress, "that Vladimir Il'ich Lenin was a warm supporter of the right of the Polish people to self-determination and that the Great October Socialist Revolution and its offspring--the Soviet Union--twice opened the way to the restoration of an independent Polish state....Now, from the rostrum of the 26th congress, I would like to stress most emphatically that we shall forever remember the Soviet Army which liberated our country from Hitlerite occupation. An act of historical justice was committed thanks to the Soviet Union: Poland returned to its ancient lands along the Oder, the Neise and the Baltic."

The various neofascist and revanchist organizations in the FRG have become noticeably energized in connection with the Polish events. The reactionary circles are launching new efforts to whitewash German fascism and militarism and to justify their strategy and policies of "Lebensraum." In the FRG the mass information media are extensively used to disseminate a distorted history of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people and the liberation mission of the Soviet Army. The idea is persistently insinuated that the "exile" of the Germans from the western part of Poland, i.e., the restoration to the Polish people of the lands along the Oder, the Neise and the Baltic, on the basis of the Yalta and Potsdam decisions, is the biggest drama of World War II and of postwar history. Revanchist feelings are being encouraged in the young and in forces which oppose the development of relations with the USSR, based on the Eastern treaties which codified the results of World War II.

The three-part "documentary" filmed for television, "Escape and Exile," produced in the FRG, is obviously provocatory. Its makers bemoan the defeat of fascist Germany, depict the "cruelty" of the victors toward the Germans and try to rehabilitate Hitler's Reich. "The film," writes Springer's DIE WELT, commenting on the picture, "is aimed at the young generation, those who are insufficiently familiar with or understand history." Unparalleled publicity accompanied the film. It was shown by the state television company throughout the country and in

Austria. Its authors are trying to fan revanchist moods and raise the Nazi slogan of "Germany, awake! The Germans will not rest without retribution!"

Who needs this ideological subversion and why? It is aimed mainly at uninformed people, at the postwar generation. Both those who took part in the war or who experienced it well know the atrocities committed by the fascist monsters against the civilian population, particularly on Soviet territory, and how many millions of people they tortured and destroyed. They also know of the humanism which the Soviet soldiers displayed toward all the liberated peoples of Europe, including the German.

This systematic policy of the Soviet government may be found in many documents. "The destruction of the German people is not our objective," the heads of the three allied powers emphasized at the Crimean conference (4-11 February 1945). Speaking at the Eighth Congress of the SED, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated: "Even in the dark years of World War II the Soviet people did not identify the working people of Germany with the criminal Hitlerite clique."

Toward the end of the war, the directival instructions issued by the supreme command to the troops of the First and Second Belorussian and First Ukrainian Fronts, signed by J. V. Stalin and A. I. Antonov, suggested that even the members of the National Socialist Party should be left alone, providing they behaved loyally toward the Red Army, and that only the leaders who failed to escape be detained.

The neofascist and revanchist organizations in the FRG are disseminating a variety of statements and pamphlets which demand the restoration of Germany within its 31 December 1937 borders. In accordance with the revanchists' demand and by decision of the conference of the German provincial ministers of cults, henceforth all textbooks and school maps will show the FRG within the borders of the Germany of 1937 and the name "Germany" will be used for the territory of the FRG and the GDR "together." Naturally, this is a gross illegality allowed by the FRG government. This has not been ignored by the Soviet Union. On 17 March 1981 the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs protested the attempt of the FRG to avoid the recognition of the postwar territorial status quo of European borders.

Bourgeois propaganda pays unjustifiably great attention to a variety of traitors and renegades who have sold out their homeland. The doors of radio and television studios and printed organs are open wide to them. Their speeches are imbued with slander of the governmental and social system of the USSR and of our armed forces. The bourgeois historians, blaspheming the memory of those who fell in the battles against fascism, are depicting the traitors, the Vlasov people, and those who cooperated with the Hitlerites not as traitors to the homeland but as supporters of a never heard of "liberation movement." Typical in this respect is the booklet "The Victims of Yalta," published in Britain. In 1980 the British authorities even decided to build a monument to the "victims of Yalta," on a piece of royal land in the very heart of London. It was reported that Prime Minister M. Thatcher was actively involved in this venture.

True science, including the science of history, is based on facts and logic. It has no use for sensationalism and publicity without which, as we know, forgeries

cannot exist. It is precisely they that are used by the falsifiers of the history of World War II. Many of them may be found in bourgeois publications. Let us give one example. Before we were even done showing the motion picture "Seventeen Instants in Spring," which, as we know, depicts the attempt by the United States to conclude a separate treaty with fascist Germany while the war was still on, a sensational forgery appeared in the West concerning meeting between Molotov and Ribbentrop allegedly held in the area of Krivoy Rog in the spring of 1943, in the course of which they allegedly discussed the conclusion of a separate peace. This forgery was printed on the title page of the book "The Second World War" by the famous British historian Liddell Hart. "At the beginning of 1943," the West German newspaper DIE WELT wrote, "the Soviet minister of foreign affairs crossed the front line somewhere in the central sector and met with the Reich's minister of foreign affairs Von Ribbentrop. The latter suggested a line of demarcation of spheres of influence running from Vil'nyus to Odessa." This meant the concession of a considerable part of the Ukraine, Belorussia and the Baltic. Naturally, no such meeting took place or could take place.

Such are some of the most popular methods used to distort the history of the war, extensively used in bourgeois propaganda in the ideological struggle. At the present stage it is trying to reach the mass audience and the young generation, and to develop a distorted view of the reasons for and the course and outcome of World War II and to touch up the disgusting face of fascism and push aside or even totally ignore the decisive role which the Soviet Union played in the defeat of Hitlerite Germany. In a word, the enemies of the peace intend to undertake the ideological training of a new army of revanchists and neofascists and then try to "replay" the war.

However, the truth cannot be concealed. The universal-historical victory of the Soviet Union and of its armed forces, which insured the freedom and independence of the peoples of many countries throughout the world, will be forever part of history and preserved in the memory of mankind. "No one has the right," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, "no one will be allowed the right to forget that the people of today owe to a tremendous extent their freedom and very existence to the heroic Soviet people, the Soviet state and the great socialist system!"

III

The bourgeois authors, together with the Maoist ideologues, speak out at length not only on the history of World War II but against the basic concepts of Marxism-Leninism on war and armed forces.

The most important Marxist-Leninist view that war is the continuation of politics through violent means has been and remains one of the main targets of the attacks of bourgeois and revisionist military ideologues.

We know that Lenin gave a scientific, a complete class interpretation to this concept expressed by K. von Clausewitz, the German military theoretician. Lenin adamantly recommended the study of previous policies covering a period of decades if one were to understand the political meaning of any war. "Unless we do this," Lenin taught, "we would not only ignore the main stipulation of scientific

socialism and of any social science in general but we would deprive ourselves of the opportunity of understanding anything concerning a modern war" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 32, p 82).

The representatives of the various bourgeois schools of so-called "social-political and natural-technological determinism" and "political realism," such as Morgenthau, Kissinger and Heidegger, joined by the Maoists, are adapting themselves to the new international and military-political circumstances and are trying, in a concealed or clear manner, to reject this Leninist approach by "proving" that under the conditions of scientific and technical progress and mass destruction weapons a war, a world war in particular, changes its nature. They try to conceal the link between war and politics and to insinuate to the people the absurd idea that at the present stage it is not imperialism and hegemonism that are the sources of war but some kind of mystical and irrational forces or else a struggle for survival which is independent of class interests.

All of these so-called theories share the common objective of suppressing, concealing and denying the class content of war and, in the final account, one way or another are reduced to anticommunism, to the effort to accuse socialism of unleashing a war, to justify the aggressive actions of imperialism and of Beijing's leadership and to declare them innocent of instigating wars and armed conflicts and of the aspiration to achieve their objectives through military force.

War has been and remains the extension of politics. It is politics, regardless of the level reached in the development of the means for waging the armed struggle. The development of military technology and of the means of warfare does not eliminate the circumstances which trigger wars or void them of their political content. At the 26th party congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev once again convincingly substantiated the view that it is precisely imperialism and Beijing's hegemonism and their policies that are a serious source of the threat of war in the contemporary world. Consequently, should they be able to unleash a war, such a war would inevitably become the extension of the adventuristic man-hating policy of imperialism and hegemonism.

A sharp ideological confrontation exists on the question of the sociopolitical nature of modern wars. Many bourgeois authors claim that the Marxist-Leninist classification of wars into just and unjust is artificial. In his book "Just and Unjust Wars" (New York, 1977) the American scientist Michael Wolzer writes that from the moral point of view no war is just. However, morality is also a class category. In their attempt to answer the question of what is a "just war" the Western military ideologues state that a simple answer would be difficult. However, they state, following the appearance of mass destruction weapons, the concept of just wars cannot be applied to a possible global nuclear missile war.

Such concepts deliberately confuse war means with objectives. Their purpose is to abolish the basic distinction between just and unjust wars, to equate them and thus to justify reactionary and aggressive wars.

Wars in defense of the gains of the revolution, socialism and progress, the independence of peoples and states and national liberation and revolutionary wars

waged by the toiling masses were and remain just. Imperialist wars against the socialist countries, wars for the seizure of foreign territories, the enslavement of other nations and the preservation of colonies and counterrevolutionary wars have always been unfair.

A very sharp confrontation between the two ideologies is taking place on the problem of war and peace. Concepts based on the idea that communist ideology is the source of wars and international tension are being disseminated in the West. Their authors are trying to prove that ideological contradictions and the ideological irreconcilability of the communists lead to wars. The groundlessness of such concepts is obvious. The ideal of communism is peace and disarmament. This is supported by the entire history of the land of the soviets and was practically confirmed through the experience of the anti-Hitlerite coalition in World War II. Despite different ideologies, the USSR, Britain, France and the United States cooperated fruitfully in the joint struggle against fascist Germany and militaristic Japan and for the restoration of peace on earth.

The history and prehistory of World War II prove that it is the adoption of a passive attitude toward the struggle against various kinds of ideological military concepts which represents a great danger to the cause of peace and peaceful coexistence. It is precisely the inadequate ideological struggle, for whatever reason, against racist theories, which support claims to "world rule" by the "Aryan race," its need for "Lebensraum," that allowed the Hitlerites to entrap the minds of a considerable segment of the German people and, in the final account, to unleash a bloodshedding war.

At the present time it is very important to expose clearly various types of militarist and neofascist "theories" as well as concepts based on the aspirations to "global leadership" on the part of the United States.

The dissemination of neo-Nazism in the FRG and other Western countries cannot fail to concern all honest people on earth, for, whatever its camouflage and as was the case on the eve of World War II, fascism has far-reaching plans directed against the basic vital interests of the peoples, the forces of democracy and socialism above all.

Fascism is the most sinister creation of imperialism. The recent past has taught us that it is precisely fascism that opens the road to war. That is why under the conditions of the current difficult international situation the exposure of the nature of fascism, its ideology, practice, cruelty and hostility to peace and social progress, in the light of the experience of the past war, is of major scientific and practical significance.

Today, on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the attack launched by fascist Germany against the Soviet Union, we are witnessing a new promotion of the myth of the "Soviet military threat." This mythical threat is mentioned from high positions by officials in Washington, London, Beijing and many other capitals. However, here is a typical detail: the defenders of this threadbare myth are repeating almost verbatim the statements by Hitler and Goebbels made at a time when they were preparing a treacherous attack against our country, attempting to present it as a "preventive" war. Reactionary bourgeois and Maoist literature has been literally flooded with all possible materials on this topic. In Japan, for

example, the book "The Landing of the Soviet Army in Japan. World War III," was published recently. A large edition of this book was published subsequently in China. The imagination of its authors is boundless. They even proceed to describe in detail the strategy and tactics of a USSR "invasion" of Japan and China.

How and for what reason do the rulers of imperialism use the myth of the "Soviet military threat?"

In his book "The Rise and Fall of the 'Soviet Threat': Domestic Sources of the Cold War Consensus" (Washington, 1980) the American researcher Allen Wolfe draws the conclusion that after World War II it was precisely the United States who deliberately initiated the cold war. Whenever the ruling circles had to justify new big military appropriations they used the myth of the "Soviet military threat." Such was the case toward the end of the 1940s, the beginning of the 1960s and again today, at the beginning of the 1980s.

Today reactionary organizations of big multinational capital such as the American "Committee on Present Danger" and the "Council on American Security" tirelessly claim that America, Western Europe and the entire "free world" are threatened by the Soviet Union. The Reagan administration has raised this campaign to the level of official Washington policy.

In Japan the demands of chauvinistic and revanchist currents have also been expressed in official governmental policy, as exemplified by the decision to mark 7 February as "Northern Territories Day," i.e., to call for the unification with Japan of the Kurilo Islands and of the southern part of Sakhalin, which are age-old Russian lands. The process of militarization in Japan covers many sides of the country's life. More than ever before, according to the Western press, today Japan is turning to the military area. One of the most typical features of Japanese remilitarization is the fact that it is taking place under the dictate of American imperialism and is closely related to the latter's global strategy. In the opinion of specialists, today's Japanese armed forces are considerably superior to the multimillion-strong imperial army of World War II in terms of fire power and are among the 10 strongest armies of the capitalist world.

Propaganda among the population, the creation of a variety of instances of military psychosis and, in the final account, substantiating in the eyes of the public an alleged need for military preparations are directly related to the myth of the "Soviet military threat." The American newspaper THE WALL STREET JOURNAL wrote that "The neutron bomb will help detente, for it will check a Russian attack." It is thus that slander lays a path for militarism and for the latest models of mass destruction weapons.

Naturally, the myth of the "Soviet military threat" is promoted with a view to questioning the defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine, which organically stems from the peace-loving Leninist foreign policy and the humanistic nature of the socialist society. Its nature and purposes have been frequently stated in official documents of the communist party and the Soviet government. "Our strategic doctrine," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, "is strictly defensive."

Naturally, when we speak of the defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine we have in mind its political purpose, which is the defense of the socialist fatherland. It must not be confused with the principles of Soviet martial art which is characterized by active and decisive combat operations and military actions based on the same interest of defending the homeland.

Why has bourgeois propaganda found it necessary to falsify Soviet military doctrine? For the sake of using it as a "lightning rod" to dull the awareness of the toiling masses. By distorting the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state imperialism is attempting to present its aggressive policy as "peaceful," allegedly aimed at repelling a possible attack by the USSR, i.e., to justify a "preventive" war against the Soviet Union, as Hitler did 40 years ago. It is thus that the contemporary theories of the aggressors approach the fascist military theories of the past.

The myths of the "Soviet military threat" and of the allegedly expansionistic Soviet military doctrine, promoted in the West, are used by bourgeois propaganda not for purposes of disinformation and disorientation of broad public circles alone. They are used by the Pentagon's military strategists for concealing the formulation of plans for a "preventive" war against the USSR and the other socialist countries and the use of the "first anticipatory strike" with a view to seizing the strategic initiative. Confirmation of this is Carter's Directive No 59, which contemplates the admissibility and even expediency of "limited" nuclear warfare.

The theory of "preventive" war has been and remains a doctrine of aggressive war. However, whereas initially this kind of war was able to give the Hitlerite aggressors some temporary advantages as a result of the treacherous and unexpected attack, under present-day conditions a "preventive" war would inevitably turn into the nuclear suicide of its instigators, for it would not remain unpunished or protect the aggressor from counterstrikes of tremendous destructive power.

IV

Unwittingly, the question arises: what is the purpose of the perennial swinging of the huge flywheel of lies and slanders against the USSR? Along with hindering the process of detente, a fact of the arms race imposed by imperialism "...is the noticeable aggravation of the ideological struggle," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress. "To the West this is not reduced to a confrontation of ideas. It is an entire system of means aimed at subverting and weakening the socialist world. The imperialists and their accomplices are systematically pursuing hostile campaigns against the socialist countries. They blacken and distort everything taking place in the those countries. Their main purpose is to turn the people away from socialism."

It is precisely for this purpose that the bourgeois misinterpreters are distorting the history of the past war and present policy of our party and Soviet government.

These are futile efforts! Time is powerless to erase from the hearts and minds of the generations the great exploit of the Soviet people. In assessing the events of

the Great Patriotic War, 40 years later, with an unabated feeling of deep respect and gratitude the peoples of many countries in the world express their admiration for the Soviet people, the people-hero and winner, the people who lost 20 million lives of its compatriots in the name of victory and of the freedom and happiness of the present and future generations.

To the Soviet people, the last war is not a thing of the past. Interest in its history, despite the tremendous number of publications on this topic in the country, remains unabated. Thus, the 12 volume "Istoriya Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny 1939-1945 Gg" (the 11th volume of which is already out), published under the guidance of a main editorial commission (chaired by D. F. Ustinov) of the USSR Ministry of Defense Institute of Military History, together with the CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism and the institutes of USSR and general history of the USSR Academy of Sciences, is very popular. This work is being simultaneously translated and published in Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia. More than 450,000 people have subscribed to this edition. There are subscribers in the capitalist countries as well. This publication was appraised by the known French military theoretician and historian, member of the academy Army Gen F. (Gambyeze) in the following words: "The 'History of World War II 1939-1945,' which has been published by the USSR Ministry of Defense starting with 1973, is a significant contribution to the study of the diplomatic, political and military events of World War II, the course of which was decisively influenced by the Soviet Army. ... Thorough research of this important period of the 20th century is very rare. Furthermore, such research fails to describe the events as fully as has been done in the Soviet work, particularly in terms of sources used."

Following is yet another opinion coming from New Zealand. In a letter to the USSR embassy history professor D. McGuirk, who read the "History of World War II," wrote: "These are splendid volumes, particularly when it comes to correcting the few works on the participation of the Soviet Union in World War II published in New Zealand. This work is splendid also in terms of the amount of documentary material presented on the Nazi aggression. It is important for students of history to become familiar with such prime sources."

In addition to extensive factual data and the accurate description of the course and outcome of the war and of its results and lessons, the definitive work "History of the Second World War 1939-1945" provides substantiated criticism of bourgeois historiography and exposes a variety of legends, versions and falsifications. In this way Soviet historical science is making a substantial contribution to the Marxist elaboration of a vitally important contemporary problem--the problem of war and peace.

The Soviet people and our party are promoting the consolidation of peace on earth. This was confirmed by the 26th CPSU Congress yet once again with tremendous emphasis. Today, 40 years after the outbreak of the Great Patriotic War, we examine the military events of 1941-1945 so that they may never be repeated, and so that the defeat of fascist Germany and militaristic Japan of World War II become an instructive lesson to those who are concocting adventuristic plans for a new and far more horrible military tragedy. Today's pretenders to world domination must not forget that history severely punishes those who scorn its lessons.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

CREATIVE POWER OF LENINIST THOUGHT AND TODAY'S CAPITALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 76-87

[Article by Yu. Ostrovityanov]

[Text] The creative spirit of Leninism pervades the materials of the 26th CPSU Congress from beginning to end. It is a vivid example of collective innovativeness which counters inertial thinking, routine and stereotype. The party's Central Committee accountability report is a document of major historical significance. The addresses of the delegates and the noted leaders of the communists, workers' and national liberation movements offer a broad summation of the experience of mature socialism and a comprehensive analysis of the prospects of the global revolutionary process in our increasingly complex and contradictory world. The main ideas of the congress are a combination of daring flight of creative Marxist thought and a realistically balanced assessment of the global situation. They represent a grand panoramic view of socialist and communist change, the enrichment of the peace program with new radical initiatives and the further development of the Leninist theory of revolution.

Launching Pad for New Searches and Discoveries

To use Stefan Zweig's metaphor, revolutions are the starry hours of mankind and the peaks of its social activeness, self expression and uplift. However, the upsurge of the historical activities of the masses is necessarily preceded by the blossoming of theoretical thinking which illuminates the complex and sometimes incredibly difficult paths of the revolution, in which any serious error or wrong step may lead to failure and even to irreparable catastrophe. It was in prerevolutionary times that the Leninist theory that the socialist revolution is an organic alloy of scientific thinking with revolutionary action, word with action and theory with practice was developed, presumably continuing creatively the revision of obsolete concepts and formulation and the stubborn defense of thoroughly substantiated new conclusions.

The law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism, which displays the main vectors of its historical dynamics in the imperialist epoch, is a starting point in this theory.

It might seem as if nothing could be more elementary than this law. It is described in all textbooks on political economy and historical materialism. Detailed descriptions of it are found in monographs and scientific publications on this topic. It is virtually impossible to find any Leninist statement related to

this law which has not been quoted or extensively discussed in all kinds of works by economists, historians or sociologists. However, as in the past, Lenin's discovery remains a magnet which irresistibly draws the attention of supporters and opponents of Marxism, and a topic and opportunity for discussion and a focal point of the conflict of opinions. Arguments and ideological struggle on this topic remain unabated.

Partial variations in the assessment of some aspects of the effect of the law of unevenness in our epoch may be found in the socialist countries and among communist party theoreticians in capitalist countries. Conversely, attempts are being made in bourgeois political economy to refute the very accuracy of Lenin's conclusions. Bourgeois political economy proclaims such conclusions obsolete and invalid, citing new processes in contemporary capitalism. In different ways, naturally, Lenin's ideas are questioned not only by bourgeois scientists but by some progressive leaders who show an occasional tendency to exaggerate the effectiveness of the efforts of the international bourgeoisie to soften its interimperialist contradictions.

What is the cause of the arguments which, again and again, raise the Leninist concept of the uneven and spasmodic economic and political development of capitalism to the epicenter of present-day ideological life?

The main reason is that Lenin studied and theoretically substantiated one of the most important laws of imperialism which defines 20th century capitalist development, its rhythm, speed, conflicting nature and contradictions. The international workers movement cannot formulate an accurate strategy and tactic without the close and thoughtful study of this law. In its aspiration somehow to paralyze the working class or integrate it within the capitalist system, the bourgeoisie as well is forced, albeit intuitively, to take into consideration the real and objective economic and political trends within bourgeois society.

No less important is something else: the headlong and accelerating changes in the social aspect of the world, the ratio between political and class forces, the tremendous changes in the capitalist economy and the deformation and modification of its laws, including that of uneven capitalist development, characteristic of the second half of our century. There have been changes in the very mechanism of the law, its forms of action and methods for resolution of the conflicts it triggers. Particularly lively discussions are taking place on the new trends in bourgeois economics and politics, the increasing consolidation of the global bourgeoisie, the aspiration of the main capitalist countries to surmount crises through joint effort and the use of contemporary methods for the redivision of spheres of economic domination and political influence.

Finally, a new generation of Marxist youth has grown up in the capitalist countries which, naturally, is insufficiently familiar with the theoretical struggle waged within our party and the Comintern on the subject of the proper understanding of the law of uneven development. It frequently fails to see the essential difference between the old and new types of unevenness in the period of premonopoly and monopoly capitalism. It does not always have a clear idea of the correlation between the equalization of the economic, scientific and technical levels of the capitalist countries and the drastic intensification of the spasmodic nature of their development.

The communists have never denied that unexplored "white spots" arise from time to time on the Marxist theoretical map of the capitalist world. However, this is no argument at all against the insurmountable viability of the Marxist-Leninist theory. True science lives a rich life only when it becomes the methodological key for the solution of complex and difficult contemporary problems.

The power of theoretical ideas lies not in canonizing or rigidifying them. It is found in their ability to be the launching pad for new searches and discoveries, to develop and renovate themselves steadily, without changes in the basic foundations. There is no better way to kill an idea than to convert it into dogma and cliche, to dry it and bleed it white, and to proclaim it unchangeable not only in terms of essence but of form, applicable to all ages or historical situations. It is no accident that, while passionately defending Marxism from any encroachments against its basic principles, Lenin emphasized that the communists do not consider Marx' theory as something complete and inviolable but as the cornerstone for a science which they must develop in all directions in order to be in step with life.

Old and New Unevenness

It is hardly necessary to prove that capitalism at the end of the 20th century is quite different from the bourgeois society of the turn of the century. The sources of spasmodic development and of the new nature of conflicts in capitalist development, however, apply specifically to the beginning stage of its monopoly phase.

On 23 August 1915, in his article "On the Slogan of United States of Europe," considering the uneven development of the capitalist countries, Lenin formulated his famous thesis in a concise aphorism: "Uneven economic and political development is the unquestionable law of capitalism." After studying this law he reached the conclusion which refuted previous traditional concepts of the route to a socialist victory. "Therefore," he wrote, "the victory of socialism initially in a few or even in a single separate capitalist country is possible" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 26, p 354). One year later, in his work "Imperialism As the Higher Stage of Capitalism," he provided a profound analysis of the nature and manifestations of the law of uneven capitalist development and defined its basic features and social consequences. Later, in 1919, in his work "The Third International and Its Place in History," Lenin refined and developed his thoughts on the link between the law of unevenness and the strategy of the struggle waged by the working class and its main objective--the seizure of power and the organization of new social relations. "Any Marxist, and even any person familiar with contemporary science in general," he pointed out, "would unquestionably answer in the negative if asked whether an even or harmonious-proportional transition of different capitalist countries to proletarian dictatorship is likely. There has never been nor could there be any smoothness, harmony or proportionality in the capitalist world. Each country has developed particularly emphatically one or another feature or aspect or group of characteristics within capitalism and the labor movement. This has been an uneven process" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 38, p 304).

Soon afterward, however, a question arose as to what type of unevenness should be considered: the one which is inherent in capitalism or the one which appears at its monopoly stage? This question triggered a polemic which quite rapidly grew into a theoretical struggle in which the communist parties as well became

involved. It reached its peak at the Seventh Expanded Plenum of the Comintern Executive Committee in 1926, when the problem of the real possibility of building socialism in the USSR and the nature of the global revolutionary process were discussed. The interpretation of the nature of the unevenness, its old and new forms, correlation between the equalization of economic and scientific and technical levels of the capitalist countries and their spasmodic development and the area and time of action of the law formulated by Lenin became subjects of particularly sharp discussions.

K. Marx himself proved that uneven development is an inherent feature of the world capitalist economy. Profit has been the motive force of capitalism and the incentive for its growth and development at all times. The capitalists, their associations and corporations and, subsequently, the capitalist countries have always turned to areas where profit levels were high and capital investments particularly advantageous. Without the constant search for areas where capital could be invested with maximum effectiveness, capitalist production itself is impossible. Developing Marx' idea, Lenin emphasized that "the capitalists divide the world not because of malice but because the level of concentration reached forces them to take this path for the sake of their profits; they divide the world in terms of "capital" and in terms of "force," for no other method for dividing the world can exist relative to a marketplace and capitalist production system. Power is applied according to the nature of the economic and political development...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 27, pp 372-373).

In the premonopoly period the seizure of new territorial spheres by the capitalist countries with a view to the extraction of profits did not create much difficulty. At that time the world had not yet been fully divided and there were vast backward yet officially independent Asian and African areas into which capital could penetrate readily. The simple export of inexpensive goods manufactured by European and North American factories and plants crushed traditional industries and wrecked petty enterprises, while the use of inexpensive local manpower was a huge additional asset.

Considerable reserves existed for the development of capitalism in depth. In the capitalist countries themselves, most of which were in Europe, there were extensive areas with precapitalist relations. Capitalism "developed" them successfully, destroying the still extant yet thoroughly rotten foundations of feudalism which it penetrated adamantly and persistently. This was largely the area of the old unevenness. Naturally, it triggered sharp conflicts which were localized within a more or less narrow circle of countries and expressed in local wars which did not trigger global military upheavals.

The situation changed radically with the advent of the monopoly stage. Capitalism became an all-embracing system. The world was split and the colonial and semicolonial periphery was divided among the leading imperialist countries which established a kind of monopoly rule over the most important aspects of the global economy. Opportunities for the development of capitalism in depth shrunk like shagreen leather. The equalization of differences in terms of economic and scientific and technical potentials enabled some countries to achieve a sharp upsurge while others declined rapidly. This gave the contradiction between them a special, unparalleled explosive power. Under this unabated threat, in the stormy atmosphere of confrontations and clashes, even superficially insignificant conflicts could be the sparks triggering a global military conflagration leading to a

redivision of the spheres of domination among the main capitalist countries in accordance with a new deployment of forces. Unevenness, which has always accompanied the development of capitalism and even of precapitalist societies, became one of its main laws.

These were the radical changes in the capitalist world that the Trotskyite-Zinov'yevite opposition, exhibited in terms of social democratic views within the communist movement, was unwilling to understand. Failing to see clearly the main lines which separated the monopoly from premonopoly capitalism, it confused its evolutionary growth with a spasmodic catastrophic development, in which the simple dissemination of capitalist relations was replaced by a fierce monopoly competition of a new type, with a merciless struggle and increasingly frequent and more powerful and objectively inevitable clashes.

In defending their views the leaders of the opposition cited examples of the tremendous gap which had developed for quite some time between capitalist Europe, which had rushed forward, and the tremendously backward colonial and dependent periphery. They also cited the example of Europe itself, where at one time England, the leading capitalist power on the continent, had substantially outstripped the other capitalist countries burdened by rudimentary feudalism economically and historically. The opposition was neither able nor willing to draw the proper conclusion based on the radical difference between the old and new forms of unevenness and between the disparity in economic, social and political levels, normal in capitalist countries, and the natural spasmodic development which arises and operates exclusively under capitalism.

The industrial monopoly of the different countries which gradually and more or less smoothly outstripped one another was confused by the opposition with the monopoly phase of the bourgeois society which alters the old and creates new patterns and trends. "The uneven and spasmodic development of individual enterprises, individual industrial sectors or individual countries are inevitable under capitalism," Lenin wrote. "Initially, earlier than others, England became a capitalist country. Toward the middle of the 19th century, as it conducted its free trade, it claimed the role of "ruler of the world," and of supplier of manufactured goods to countries throughout the world who, in turn, were to supply it with raw materials. However, this English monopoly was already undermined in the final quarter of the 19th century, for a number of other countries had erected "protective" customs barriers and developed into independent capitalist states. On the threshold of the 20th century we saw the formation of another kind of monopoly: first, monopoly alliances of capitalists from all developed capitalist countries; second, the development of a monopoly position of a few of the richest countries, in which the accumulation of capital reached a gigantic size" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 27, p 359).

The power or, as Marx sometimes liked to say, the muscles of a truly progressive theory may be found in the ability to see at once the barely noticeable, almost invisible line which marks the end of one and the beginning of an entirely different historical period. The theoretical myopia of the opposition prevented it from understanding and properly accepting Lenin's entirely new idea that "old capitalism has become obsolete" (Ibid., p 342), and that traditional unevenness had begun to coexist with an unevenness of an entirely different type, characteristic of the imperialist countries. In substantiating their views the opposition

leaders also formulated the thesis of the reduction, abating and smoothing over of economic contrasts under imperialism as distinct from the situation in the premonopoly bourgeois society. This one-dimensional thinking, the narrowness of their scientific outlook, dogmatism and use of formal logic prevented them from understanding the direct tie between the equalization of the economic and scientific and technical potential of the capitalist countries and the law of uneven capitalist development.

In reality, as the Leninist nucleus in the communist movement proved, it was this equalization, created by production internationalization and socialization, that provided a springboard for the spasmodic leaps of an isolated country or a group of countries which, at an insane and truly mad pace, may outstrip the other capitalist countries. "As a whole," Lenin emphasized, "capitalism is growing immeasurably more rapidly compared with the past. However, not only is this growth becoming more uneven but the unevenness is manifested, in particular, in the decay affecting the strongest capitalist countries (England) (Ibid., pp 422-423). He gave the United States and Japan as examples. They increased their strength "immeasurably more rapidly than backward monarchic Europe which was beginning to decay from old age. Compared with the United States, Europe as a whole is in a state of economic stagnation" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 26, p 354).

Today, as a result of the tremendous changes which have taken place in the world, an entirely different picture has developed. The United States, until recently the unquestionable "ruler" of the capitalist part of the globe, is already feeling the irrepressible closing in of its "partners" who are, in fact, its rivals: Japan and Western Europe. As was emphasized in the accountability report of the CC CPSU to the 26th party congress, the Japanese and Western European monopolies are competing ever more successfully with American capital, even on the domestic U. S. market.

Western Europe is not only no longer the citadel of monarchic regimes but, after discarding the burden of obsolete working capital as a result of World War II and the postwar state-monopoly changes, gained its second wind. After its defeat in the war, Japan engaged in the reconstruction of its economy and gained a pace of economic growth which is threatening to the other capitalist countries. Canada, the former British dominion, not previously considered a progressive capitalist country in general, has rushed far ahead. Stagnation is already striking at the economic organism of the United States itself which was considered until recently a symbol of capitalist youth, dynamism and invincible thrust. The zigzags of history in the imperialist epoch are turning the capitalist world into a scale in constant motion in which one of the arms is always heavier. However, any shift in the balance invariably entails a redivision of spheres of economic influence and political domination, something which was previously impossible without a world war.

The irony of history was shown, in particular, in the fact that the culminating point of the law of unevenness--world wars--while weakening imperialism as a whole, marked the beginning of its end and created conditions which enabled the proletarian revolution to break the imperialist chain at its weakest link and insure the victory of socialism in a single country. In the period which followed the Great October Revolution the successes of socialism, initially in a single country and then in a number of countries, and the founding of the world socialist

system radically changed the international circumstances and eliminated the fatal inevitability of world wars. This led to major changes in the manifestation of the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism.

Therefore, the law of unevenness appeared in the period of the growth of premonopoly capitalism into imperialism. The economic, scientific and technical equalization of the leading capitalist countries became its economic foundation; the spasmodic development which allowed one or another group of previously backward countries suddenly to assume progressive bridgeheads in the capitalist world became its essence; antagonistic contradictions among imperialist countries, which periodically dragged into their conflicts new countries, became its area of action; world wars, revolutions, and the founding of the socialist system, which is triggering modifications in the mechanism of the law, became its consequences.

Does this mean that the old unevenness has vanished from the historical stage? No, it has become interwoven with a new unevenness. Under monopoly and state-monopoly capitalism, particularly in the second half of our century, it has changed profoundly. A clear example is the old although modified unevenness which has existed for centuries and which represents an ever intensifying economic gap between industrial capitalist countries and former colonies and semicolonies.

A Cleft Becomes a Precipice

The contemporary world capitalist economy is a mosaic of economic and political systems and social forms. It allows the coexistence within itself of incredible combinations of countries with a developed state-monopoly economy, countries which have reached an average capitalist development and a vast developing world in which the splinters and embryos of all past and present production methods have become intertwined. All that unites them is the fact that they are members of the single global economic capitalist system which includes, as Lenin pointed out, backward countries as well (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 27, p 360). However, this is an antagonistic unity in which parts of the global capitalist economy are incompatible with others, separating and clashing together in a merciless rivalry and struggle. The main demarcation line of this struggle runs between the industrial, state-monopoly countries and the huge number of young national states whose characteristic feature is their growing socioeconomic backwardness.

The sharp, the overwhelming contrast between disparities in the economic development of the capitalist countries and the developing world, on the one hand, and the rapidly growing political role of the latter, on the other, is the paradoxical situation in which the majority of liberated countries find themselves as they turn in the orbit of global economic capitalist relations, as well as one of the new forms of the old unevenness.

The cascade of national liberation revolutions, which destroyed the old colonial system within an extremely short time, turned the developing world into a powerful generator of political high tension currents which reach the leading capitalist centers instantly through modern widespread communications channels and high tension lines, triggering vortexes of ever increasing tension and power. Each major event in the developing world--a radical change in the internal course of one or another country, a change in its foreign political orientation, a coup

d'etat or a clash among basic social forces, or civil or regional wars--as a rule creates a loud echo. It interrupts the normal course of world politics, confuses the leading circles of the imperialist countries and demands of the international organizations responsible decisions. In the United Nations, for example, the young national countries have become one of the dominating forces without whose support no single important resolution can be passed.

At the same time, however, the political role which these countries play sharply clashes with their economic lagging, which is intensified by the tremendous demographic explosion which essentially reduces to naught achievements in industrial and agricultural development. Between 1950 and 1976 the population in the liberated countries jumped from 1,060,000,000 to 1,944,500,000. More than a decade ago demographers had forecast that by the year 2000 four out of five people on earth will live in Asia, Africa or Latin America. Against this background the economic gap between the liberated and the industrialized capitalist countries and the increasing warp of the global capitalist economy appear particularly threatening. Suffice it to say that the territory inhabited by two-thirds of the population on earth accounts for no more than seven percent of the global industrial output. No less striking is the disparity in income levels between the centers of global capitalism and its periphery. Between 1950 and 1980 it fluctuated in the 11:1-13:1 range.

The scientific and technical revolution, which spread throughout the world, penetrated into the seemingly forever forgotten corners of the earth. In the capitalist area, despite all its dramatic consequences, such as the destruction of the environment, the impudent triumph of consumer ideals, the appearance of new and refined exploitation methods, the increased alienation of man, the rapid stratification of the intelligentsia and the conversion of a large segment of it into spiritual proletariat, and open trade in scientific ideas, it nevertheless contributed to economic growth, scientific successes and major changes in the production structure.

In many liberated countries the progress of the scientific and technical revolution was slow, sluggish and anemic. Imported here as a secondary, an auxiliary phenomenon, with few exceptions it did not provide the incentive for scientific discoveries. In addition to the inability to adapt it to local conditions the poverty of the developing world and its shortage of financial resources played a tremendous role. The gap between capitalist and former colonial and dependent countries in terms of outlays for scientific research and development reached approximately 55:1 and, on a per capita basis, 142:1. The most important feature, however, was the economic and social destructiveness of Western scientific and technical progress in terms of the developing world. The gap within this world developed not as a natural process growing on national soil but as a harbinger of an alien and hostile civilization and culture. It became a channel for the draining of natural resources and talents. It failed to provide a new content but instead destroyed many types of traditional industries and triggered unparalleled unemployment. According to the International Labor Organization, by the mid-1970s there were about 300 million unemployed in the young national states.

Such are the scant statistical gains which, better than any color, paint a picture of the uneven development separating the centers and periphery of the global capitalist economy. The crack which formed several centuries ago has turned into a gaping economic precipice as our century nears its end.

The progressive lagging of the former colonies and semicolonies behind the industrialized capitalist countries is usually denied by citing references to the relatively impressive rates of economic growth of the young national states. It is true that their share in the overall gross national product of the capitalist countries rose from 14.5 to 18.5 percent, including an increase in industry from 8.5 to 15.5 percent, between 1950 and 1980.

However, the phenomenon of the liberated countries cannot be understood unless we take into consideration that it is precisely here that the new unevenness is deposited on top of the old one and that the law of spasmodic development went into effect particularly actively. Countries appeared, which took the capitalist way, forming their own monopolies which, it is true, were quite different. Such countries may be found somewhere between monopoly capital and the developing world, being both the subject and the object of economic expansion. It is just they, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, South Korea and certain others, that account for over one-half the overall increase in the new industrial output of the young national states. Meanwhile, the industrial growth of the poorest among them--the biggest group of liberated countries in terms of population size--was essentially infinitesimal or even null. Such a situation could hardly have been possible had capitalism in the past, through its system of colonialism and dependence, not drawn into its field of gravity most Latin American, Asian and African countries. Already capitalism had established in such countries a few scattered industrial centers, leaving untouched huge areas with archaic economic and social relations. Capitalism and the industrial enclaves it created in these areas sucked off the juices of the colonial and dependent countries, exhausted them entirely and greatly intensified their already static or stagnating economic development.

Today history is being repeated on a higher turn of the spiral. The multinational corporations are entangling the liberated countries in a web of economic dependence. They are trying to tie them to the capitalist system through a new division of labor and to use them as suppliers of raw materials, semifinished goods and inexpensive manpower and as a market for finished goods and areas to which they can shift ecologically harmful industries.

Imperialism is one of the most important sources of the economic backwardness and social and political instability of the developing world. This is clearly understood by ever broader population strata and by many governments of young national states. They become truly hyperreactive when they hear the term "capitalism." They put the struggle for economic independence on their agenda, they acquire sovereignty over their natural resources, and they have formulated and, with the support of the world socialist comity, are trying to implement the idea of a new international economic order whose objective would be to put an end to the unequal situation of the developing countries in the international capitalist division of labor. Unquestionably, the success achieved in this struggle will undermine the foundations of monopoly capitalism and, consequently, narrow the range of action of the law of uneven economic and political development.

A New Equalization Round

According to the rules of formal logic the concepts of spasmodic development and equalization are conflicting and mutually exclusive. However, dialectics, which defines the development of society, precisely presumes their conflicting unity, complex interdependence and antagonistic interconnection. Equalization is a bridgehead for the tempestuous upsurge of one or another capitalist country, creating an impulse for a new round of equalization. The straggling countries join the economic race and do everything possible to catch up with those ahead of them, as a result of which once again their national economies tend to equalize.

New profound changes have taken place in the citadels of imperialism, from which the law of uneven economic and political development spread throughout the entire capitalist world. They include structural changes in industry and agriculture, the conversion of private monopoly capital into state monopoly capital, its emergence on the international arena and unparalleled scales of production internationalization and socialization. As Lenin predicted, there takes place a "development and increased frequency of all kinds of relations among nations, the breakdown of national barriers and the creation of an international capitalist unity, unity in economic life in general, in politics, science and so on" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 24, p 124).

The faster development of foreign trade compared with the general economic growth of the capitalist countries is one of the forms of internationalization. Thus, Great Britain exports 39 percent of its output whereas imports account for 32 percent of its entire consumption; the respective figures are 36 and 31 percent for the FRG, 16 and 15 percent for Japan, and 10 and 9 percent for the United States.

Capital exports are growing even faster than foreign trade. Between 1945 and 1975 the long-term foreign investments of the main imperialist countries jumped approximately tenfold, reaching $580 billion. The best of the records, however, was set by international trade in technology, patents, licenses and industrial secrets. Its average annual growth rates even outstripped the growth rates of entrepreneurial capital. In the capitalist countries the internationalization of economic life unavoidably converts into its monopolization and into the tempestuous development of multinational corporations. It is precisely they which have become the real economic empires which have entangled the entire nonsocialist part of the world in the web of their affiliates.

The internationalization of economic life created a trend toward its integration and the creation of a system of state-monopoly control over international economic relations. This trend was manifested mainly in the creation of the European Economic Community. The treaty on the founding of the community was initialed on 25 March 1957. It was institutionalized on 1 January 1959.. "At midnight, on 1 January," then wrote IL TEMPO, the Italian journal, while everyone was noisily celebrating the beginning of 1959, a new, great universal power was being born silently--the European Economic Community... This power began to act by putting an end to the abstract concepts of treaties...." Since that time "this new...universal power" has covered a long twisting road, full of contradictions and reciprocal repulsions and attractions. However, the concentration and coordination of capital through the zigzags and retreats led to its even greater consolidation.

According to the bourgeois economists integration or, to use the current fashionable Western term, economic interdependence neutralizes the effect of the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism. An attempt has been made to prove this in the latest and perhaps most frank Western forecast entitled "Encounter With the Future," written by a group of experts headed by Prof Jacques (Lezourne) within the framework of the "Interfutures" project, commissioned by the OECD. The forecast does not conceal many of the real contradictions, difficulties and ills of contemporary bourgeois society such as low growth rates, inflation, unemployment, the adverse effect of the energy and raw material crisis, the aggravation of the food problem and balance of payments deficits. Nevertheless, five of the six suggested scenarios for the future as a whole predict a smoothing and abatement of the frictions among developed capitalist countries while only the final, the sixth, forecasts the worsening of the conflict among them.

Many bourgeois researchers consider equalization simply as the opposite of spasmodic development and the interpenetration of the national capitalist economic systems a peaceful economic harmony. In reality, the internationalization of the capitalist economy prepares the grounds for the next spasmodic leap and triggers new incentives for rivalry and confrontation. The nearly 100 year old history of imperialism confirms the accuracy of Lenin's statement. He wrote that "Financial capital and the trusts do not weaken but intensify differences among the rate of growth of the different parts of the world economy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 27, p 394).

A unique situation developed in the capitalist world after World War II. A single country--the United States--dominated almost completely its economy and politics. The United States became not only the ruler but the benefactor and, in many cases, the savior of the international bourgeoisie by strengthening the foundations of capitalism, which had weakened in the course of the war, and protecting it from the powerful pressure of the toiling masses. It might have appeared that all concepts concerning the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism had disappeared forever. The Western European economy, corrupted and weakened by the war, not to speak of that of defeated Japan, did not reject but thirsted for American investments. Canada found itself firmly tied to the United States and obediently followed its economic strategy. The gap between the economic power of the United States and the other capitalist countries was so wide that many people could not see how it could be bridged in the foreseeable future. However, only 15 years later everything changed. The law of uneven development proved its full effectiveness again.

The per capita gross national product is the best illustration of the new deployment of forces in the global capitalist economy. If we take the U. S. level as equaling 100 percent, the average level of all other capitalist countries rose from 30 percent in 1950 to 67 percent in 1976 (here and subsequently the 1950 indicators are computed in terms of 1970 prices while those of 1976 are given in current prices). However, the picture becomes even more striking if we take the capitalist countries individually. In this case, within the period under consideration, the per capita gross national product rose from 71 to 106 percent for Canada, from 68 to 114 percent for Sweden, from 39 to 98 percent for Norway, from 51 to 96 percent for Denmark, from 34 to 92 percent for the FRG, from 39 to 83

percent for France, from 57 to 112 percent for Switzerland, from 58 to 91 percent for Australia, from 38 to 82 percent for The Netherlands, from 44 to 50 percent for Great Britain, from 22 to 68 percent for Austria, from 12 to 62 percent for Japan and from 20 to 38 percent for Italy.

These figures are the embodiment of the spasmodic economic development of the capitalist countries. All of them are drawn to a single magnet, the United States, which they are trying to catch up with and outstrip. Canada, Sweden and Switzerland have already resolved their "super problem:" they have outstripped for this indicator the most powerful capitalist country. Many countries have come very close to the United States, literally breathing down its neck. At the same time, drastic differences in growth rates may be noted among the countries rushing to catch up with the United States.

All six scenarios of the "Encounter With the Future" forecast state that the share of the United States in the gross social product of the nonsocialist world will be reduced and will decline by the year 2000. The authors write: "The relative overall economic power of the United States will diminish considerably... This reflects the development of the rest of the world as well as the specific difficulties encountered by American society.... Although the United States remains the biggest world economic power, its global situation is no longer exclusive..." At the same time, they point out, the role of Japan and Western Europe is growing.

As a whole, the processes of equalization and spasmodic development are intertwined in the capitalist world. The pulse beat of its economic development is not smooth, even or regular. It is spasmodic and irregular, either speeding up feverishly or diminishing and disappearing, triggering major disruptions in the entire organism of contemporary capitalism. The biggest such disruption was the cyclical upheaval of 1974-1975, which was combined with the energy, raw material and structural crises. It stopped or delayed the progress of the capitalist economy and predetermined the sluggish growth rates of the second half of the 1970s. Numerous data indicate that today the United States, Britain, Canada and some other countries have slid into a new crisis. As a whole, as the CC CPSU accountability report pointed out, capitalism is experiencing its third economic decline over the past 10 years.

The equalization of the capitalist economy has aggravated interimperialist contradictions to their extreme. It has taken the bourgeois society to a limit beyond which a general political upheaval is possible. The wound spring may be released at any moment and cast on the surface most acute frictions, discords and conflicts which are still largely latent. They are due to the same old reason: aspiration for the redistribution of spheres of influence and domination. However, in our epoch the forms of this redistribution change sharply.

Unquestionable Content But Arguments About Form

The development of contemporary capitalism does not resemble the smooth flow of a river in the least. It is rather like a fuse with a dynamite charge at the end, wherein the ever faster spreading of a small flame can bring about a deafening explosion. However, the characteristic feature of this explosion is obviously that

it will soon assume the appearance of a series of economic and political explosions which, were these disparate and divisive forces to be combined, would acquire a tremendous destructive power. These two comparisons, which resemble literary metaphors more than strictly scientific definitions, nevertheless express clearly and contrastingly the changes in the effect of the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism.

Time has left its mark on all aspects of the manifestation of this law. The main one is the long absence of war among capitalist countries, which was used in the past as the principal means for the solution of interimperialist contradictions. In fulfilling the role which is similar to the function of a crisis in the economic cycle, temporarily they made consistent the actual international situation of one or another imperialist country with its economic and military potential, and created a shaky balance in the global capitalist economy which was disturbed, again, by the rivalry among bourgeois countries.

Naturally, all of this does not exclude the possibility of a general military confrontation. The serious warning regarding the frightening consequences of a drastic intensification of imperialist aggressiveness was heard throughout the world from the rostrum of the 26th CPSU Congress. Imperialist aggressiveness undermines international stability and increases the threat of the outbreak of wars which would be a mortal threat to all mankind, including the bourgeoisie. The suggestion contained in the CC CPSU accountability report is more timely today than ever before: the convening of a special session of the United Nations Security Council on improving the situation on our planet, attended by the highest officials of the countries, to broaden the area of trust, to proclaim entire countries and continents as nuclear-free, and to set up a prestigious international committee consisting of the most noted scientists to prove the vital need to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. These suggestions have earned the broad support of the world public and drawn its attention to the existing threat. They have vividly expressed the unabated aspiration of the peoples for peace and strengthened their will to convert peaceful coexistence into an irreversible process and to stop new splashes of militaristic feelings.

We must also take into consideration that the growing number of progressive changes in the world, such as the consolidation and successes of the socialist comity, the achievement of a military-strategic balance between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, the breakdown of the colonial system, the upsurge of the national liberation movement and the intensification of the class struggle in the citadels of imperialism, drastically reduces if not totally excludes the possibility of a global military redivision of the world. In the new historical circumstances war among the main imperialist countries, not to mention a universal military conflagration, would mean the end of capitalism, its quick and inevitable breakdown.

World socialism and the liberation struggle of the peoples have made other adjustments as well to the economy and policies of the bourgeois society. The former have accelerated the bourgeoisie's cosmopolitanism, strengthened its international solidarity, led it to deduce the importance of extinguishing revolutionary fires in various parts of the planet and of mutually overcoming the most serious difficulties of the capitalist economy. To

borrow Lenin's words, we see the beginning of a clear outline of a "general alliance of imperialists of all countries, based on economic capitalist alliance, a natural and inevitable alliance aimed at the protection of capital which has no country" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 328).

All of these new phenomena could not fail to change the forms of influence on international relations of the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism. This became the topic of discussions and exchange of views among Marxists. Some reduce these changes to an evolutionary redivision of spheres of influence, resembling the swinging of a pendulum; others, conversely, depict them as the intensification of contradictions whose pressure is increased as a result of the impossibility of their quick and full resolution; a third group defends the viewpoint of the predominence of centripetal forces in the capitalist world, while a fourth believes the forces to be centrifugal. In our view, all of them contain a grain of truth. What is important in the assessment of complex historical processes is not to confuse the subjective aspirations of the ruling circles of capitalist countries toward class unification with the objective possibilities of its achievement. In this case this consolidation is temporary whereas the contradictions are internal, regardless of the unusual appearance they may assume. "...In order to understand what is happening," Lenin wrote, "one must know what problems are being resolved by changes of forces and whether these are 'purely' economic or noneconomic changes (military, for example). This is a secondary problem which can change nothing in the basic views on the latest capitalist epoch" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 27, p 373).

Currently the struggle for commodity and service markets, raw material and energy sources, sites for profitable capital investments, scientific and technical knowledge and inventions in promising science-intensive sectors and for the use of scientific and technical cadres is continuing. Currency battles are being fought ceaselessly and fierce squirmishes on the subject of gold reserves are being fought. For some time there have been three power centers--the United States, Western Europe and Japan--who are fighting for dominance over the capitalist part of the world. Eventually, Canada may become a fourth such center, because of its as yet insufficiently evaluated economic opportunities, impressive size, raw materials, highly developed industry and progressive agriculture. Some Western forecasts rate highly the prospects of Australia to become yet another pole of economic power by the beginning of the 21st century. The capitalist world is being splintered and divided into opposing groups, alliances and zones among which, at present mainly among the United States, Western Europe and Japan, the main lines of unabated economic battles run.

The increasing interimperialist contradictions and the political passions they trigger, passions which occasionally reach a high pitch, do not develop into frontal confrontations or open and direct economic warfare. Faced with the socialist comity and the national liberation movement, imperialism is trying to conceal, to camouflage its conflicts and to create the appearance of unity and the impression of relative harmony. The regular conferences held by the heads of the "big seven"--the United States, Japan, the FRG, Great Britain, France, Italy and Canada--at which serious economic problems such as the crisis situations with their consequences, inflation, monetary policies, international trade, energy

supplies, unemployment, and settling of economic conflicts among capitalist countries are discussed, represent one such attempt. Initially the United States tried to assume the role of a messiah who will save capitalism from economic upheavals. It soon became apparent, however, that having lost its former power, it was no longer able to become the "locomotive engine" which could pull the capitalist train out of the swamp of economic difficulties. It was at that point that the concept of the "three locomotive engines"--the United States, the FRG and Japan--was born. However, they too failed to cope with their assignment and were forced to seek the help of small countries, including Switzerland and The Netherlands. Many of the meetings by the "seven" have taken place in an atmosphere of acute discord. Such was the case, for example, when the question of granting aid to Italy and Britain was being discussed. Such aid was based on a review of their economic policies and their obligation to apply stiff economy measures.

Let us emphasize that a careful study of the desire of the ruling circles of the leading capitalist countries to prove their "unity" and to find the outlines for a common economic strategy inevitably reveals the aggressive nature of imperialism. The seven most powerful countries are actually trying to impose their will on the remaining capitalist countries. They are promoting development plans to which the other countries must adapt their own. The conferences themselves are yet another proof of the insurmountable nature of the contradictions which are tearing up contemporary bourgeois society. We find in them a paradoxical interweaving of the aspiration toward unification and the ineradicable differences of economic and political interests, centripetal and centrifugal trends, joint activities and intensifying divisions. The "Encounter With the Future" forecast as well does not exclude the even worse aggravation of relations among capitalist countries which, according to its authors, will try to involve several developing countries in their confrontation. In particular, it contemplates the possibility of the appearance of new closed economic zones such as "United States-Latin America," "EEC-Africa" and "Japan-Oceania and Southeast Asia." The redivision of spheres of influence, even if accomplished peacefully, is impossible without conflicting capitalist development. Furthermore, it is intensifying. The boil is not lanced, the disease is spreading inside the body. New contradictions are added to the old and the entire capitalist organism is weakening.

Guide Along the Trails of the Revolution

Revolutionary theory is not the result of scholarly thoughts. It projects the practice, strategy and tactics of the proletariat. It is their compass and guide. Lenin always believed that the bastions of international capital could not be stormed successfully without taking political unevenness into consideration. He considered any revolutionary action a combination of the unbearable pressure of the exploited masses and the sober analysis of even most insignificant changes in political circumstances. Unquestionably, tremendous changes are occurring in the contemporary world. However, the creative method of the Leninist theory of the socialist revolution remains unchanged. "Even 70 people like Marx," Lenin wrote, "would have been unable to register the sum total of all of these changes with their ramifications, which are taking place in the capitalist global economy. The main thing is that the laws governing such changes have been discovered and that the objective logic of such changes and of their historical development has been indicated in its essential and basic features...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 18, p 345). These words can be applied to Lenin's great legacy as well. He developed and

substantiated the objective logic of the socialist revolution, based on the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism, and left the communists a theory which they are developing in all directions and implementing in practice.

One of the most complex problems of political unevenness is the ratio between the objective and subjective prerequisites for a socialist revolution. Today it is virtually impossible to find a country with a developed state-monopoly economy which lacks the material foundations for a new civilization, which are necessary for initiating the transition from the prehistory of mankind to its true history. In its development capitalism has reached the type of "sound barrier" behind which begins its own negation, the objective refutation of the foundations on which the capitalist economy, the system of exploitation, the bourgeois way of life, and the scale of its values and priorities begin. The vast state sector, which has reached particularly big dimensions in the leading Western European countries, governmental control of the economy, planning on the scale not merely of enterprises and monopolies but of entire international production complexes and the faster development and even predominance in some governmental nonproduction areas of credit cards and electronic systems, which are a prototype of the new cash, will clearly reduce in the future the use of treasury and bank notes and checks. These are all the opposites of private initiative, its antagonists, its rivals and its opponents. The dialectics of the historical process is that the measures taken by the ruling classes for the rescuing of capitalism from anarchy, cyclical explosions, crushing inflationary waves and uncontrolled economic reactions strengthen the bourgeois society on the one hand, and on the other, undermine and weaken it, breaking ground for the building of socialism and communism.

As early as 1916 Lenin proved that "Capitalism in its imperialist stage...pushes, so to say, the capitalists, despite their will and awareness, into some sort of new social order, a transitional period from total competitive freedom to total socialization" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 27, pp 320-321). In the last decade the socialization of economic life in the capitalist countries has reached such a scale that it is extremely hard to harmonize it with the private acquisition of the results of labor and with the private ownership of productive capital. In our time capitalism represents the combination of what cannot be combined, the unification of what cannot be united, a unity split within itself, in which everything is opposed to and contradicts everything else.

Another paradox is that the awareness of the considerable percentage of working people in capitalist countries to whom history has entrusted the mission of putting an end to the exploitation of man by man and creating a new social system, occasionally fall behind the objective processes developing within the bourgeois society. As we know, the growth of the revolutionary awareness of the proletariat and its transformation from a "class within itself" into a "class for itself" do not take place automatically. They are prepared by Marxist theory and the purposeful activities of communist parties which organize and train the political army of the revolution to be flexible and to take skillfully into consideration the shades within the social situation while remaining consistent, convinced and able not to replace the founding conceptual principles with tactical considerations.

The ruling monopoly bourgeoisie is doing everything possible to reduce, muffle and hinder the social activeness of the proletariat, to instill in it consumer

stereotypes, develop the virus of philistine morality, squeeze its struggle into the narrow channel of purely economic demands and prevent it from abandoning its status as "class within itself." It is trying to use to its benefit the profound changes occurring within the structure of the working class and, above all, the tremendous increase in the size of the intellectual proletariat. The objective of these efforts is to pit some detachments of the working class against others and promote a clash among their still not entirely coinciding interests, views and living and working incentives. In repelling the frenzied ideological pressure of the bourgeoisie, the communist parties are introducing among the masses revolutionary ideas, principles of true democracy and social equality and the ideals of communism and of a society in which, as Marx and Engels said, the free development of one will become a condition for the free development of all.

Today the struggle for the most promising, best educated and growing strata of the working class, employed in the main centers of capitalist production, distribution and management assumes particular gravity. The state-monopoly complex is trying to subordinate them to the ruling ideology, deprive them of independent class thinking and tie them to capitalism for a long time. Its main weapon in the struggle for such strata is to assure them of a relatively high living standard, tireless ideological indoctrination and efforts to instill in the highly skilled and intellectual proletariat distorted ideas regarding its special social status. To the ideological bourgeois stereotypes the communists oppose the humanistic traditions of Marxism-Leninism. They not only expose the true level of economic exploitation of the working people but also appeal to permanent moral values, expose the callous nature of the anonymous power of capital and governmental bureaucracy, prove the inevitability of depersonalization under conditions of state-monopoly capitalism and offer a planned anticapitalist alternative for social development.

Today the political unevenness, which is manifested in the different levels of social tension not only in individual countries but in individual areas within a single capitalist country, is greatly determined by the successes in the battle of ideas. The rejection of capitalism as a system and of the bourgeois way of life by the working masses may, in some cases, become grounds for a drastic radicalization of the political circumstances compared with economic factors. Each area, country or region represents a unique combination of economic, social and conceptual characteristics which can trigger a powerful anticapitalist protest or, conversely, doom society to lengthy political stagnation. Lenin, who was always an irreconcilable opponent of all falsified systems, frozen dogmas and static concepts, called upon the proletarian parties "to be maximally flexible in their tactics." He adamantly emphasized that the leading center of the revolution "cannot be based on stereotyped and mechanically equalized tactical rules of the struggle" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 41, pp 77, 87).

The purposefulness and persistence of the bourgeoisie are combined in contemporary capitalist reality with decay, softening and unbalancing. However, we must not forget that the bourgeoisie does not merely repeat after St. Arsenius the call of the revolution "Fuge, tace, quiesse"--"Run, stop, calm down"--but is also successfully acting against it, mobilizing its resources and means, whether social, economic, spiritual or military, systematically, adamantly and persistently. Portugal and, to a certain extent, Italy, may be cited as recent examples. Their

ruling circles faced the dilemma of either allowing the communists to join the government or to be deprived of economic aid. An earlier example is that of France in 1968 when the tremendous revolutionary upsurge could be surmounted only by the joint efforts of the international bourgeoisie.

Naturally, the desperate and futile storming of capitalist defenses in periods of consolidation and unification of the exploiting classes is a major error. A no lesser error, however, is to miss the opportunity of seizing power at a time when the bourgeoisie is involved in civil strife, contradictions, quarrels and fights. Had the Cuban revolutionaries, headed by F. Castro, failed to use this opportunity, the revolutionary process in Latin America would have been pushed back for decades.

When we study our own time we must not forget also the disgust for the bourgeois way of life which is spreading among the intelligentsia and even among some bourgeois strata themselves. In his time, Edgar Faure, the French bourgeois political leader, noted the indomitable epidemic of disgust which pervaded society's attitude toward itself. In the course of their struggle, today the revolutionary forces can rely not only on the proletariat and its allies but on individual progressive members of the bourgeoisie, including some within the state apparatus. They cannot fail to experience the influence of the broad toiling strata whose views on the objectives of labor, the consequences of economic growth and the very purpose of mankind are changing sharply. It is no accident that many bourgeois economists and sociologists are forced to seek today not only the shortest ways to economic growth, accumulation and profits, but to concentrate their studies on the quality of life, environmental protection and the type of work system which could exclude routine labor operations and offer the working people the opportunity for independence, autonomy and initiative. Today Marx rather than such universally acknowledged authorities of bourgeois science such as Valras, Pareto, Samuelson or Friedman, is becoming the most popular scientist in the West. Like contemporary capitalism, the revolutionary process has become increasingly complex. However, complexity is not a sign of weakness. In our day broader horizons open to revolutions, whether peaceful or violent.

In the past, addressing himself to the image of the Paris Commune, P. Antokol'skiy wrote:

> This is their 19th century.
> For us it has been broken down into quotations.
> From this point, look at the 20th
> century covered in darkness.
> You will find out about this period, comrade,
> in the blaze of the May storm.
> These explosions, these gaps left by fires,
> these torches are our trump cards.

If we were to change the period and the address, the words of the poet reflect quite accurately the historical fate of Lenin's doctrine. It played a tremendous role in the victory of the October Revolution, burned in the flames of class conflicts in many capitalist countries, and provided inestimable aid to the antifascist resistance movement in World War II. It contributed to the victory of

socialism in a number of countries, the founding of the world socialist system and the upsurge of the national liberation struggle. Tempered in revolutionary battles, it remains our banner, the ideological foundation of the science developed by CPSU congresses and Marxist-Leninist international thinking, and a guide along the most difficult revolutionary itineraries of our age.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

'ARMED PROPAGANDA': AN ALLIANCE BETWEEN ULTRALEFT EXTREMISM AND RIGHTIST FORCES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 88-96

[Text] Reactionary circles in the West have mounted their regular scale anticommunist campaign. This time the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are accused of involvement with the international and domestic terrorism which has hit the capitalist world. Characteristically, all revolutionary and liberation movements in the world are falsely identified as "terrorist." It is thus that the reactionary imperialist circles, as the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress states, "have truly set themselves the objective of reaching the unreachable: to erect a barrier on the path of progressive changes in the world and to regain the role of controllers of the destinies of nations."

The paradoxical fact is that the voice of the new Washington administration is the loudest in this chorus of false voices, although it is no secret to anyone that it is precisely American imperialism that is ubiquitously promoting terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. Bloody violence committed against differently thinking people within the country and a conspiracy with reactionary terror in the international arena have become for the United States a norm and a daily activity. Once the American newspaper THE INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE openly noted that "Over the past 35 years the U. S. government has regularly used terrorism as a foreign policy weapon." This terrorism comes closer to internal terrorism, confirming once again Lenin's conclusion that at its highest stage capitalism creates and nurtures "reaction along all lines." The present article describes one of the means by which the reactionary forces express their political interest in the existence and development of political terrorism.

A wave of terrorism has spread over a number of Western European countries in recent years. The explosions of bombs planted by extreme rightists have merged with the thunder of bombs and bursts of machine gun fire, the responsibility for which has been assumed by a variety of extreme-left groups through anonymous

telephone calls to bourgeois newspapers. In Italy alone and on the basis of very incomplete data the number of crimes committed by terrorists "in the name of the people and for their freedom" exceeded 2,000 in 1979. The results were dozens killed and many hundreds wounded. Extremist groups have become greatly energized in the FRG, Portugal, Spain, France and some Asian and Latin American countries. Each act of terrorism, particularly when committed by extreme-left groups, has been the subject of thorough coverage by mass information media belonging to or controlled by right-wing forces.

This phenomenon has been described as "armed propaganda" (a term coined by Carlos Mariguella, a Brazilian leader of the extreme left) and has drawn the attention of numerous Western researchers. It has also been the subject of extensive publications in which bourgeois sociologists and sociopsychologists, on the basis of their own class positions, naturally, are trying to distort the true reasons for this phenomenon and to use it in the interests of the ruling elites.

In 1963 the American weekly NEWSWEEK reported an attack in Venezuela on...an exhibit of French impressionist paintings. Four people carrying automatic weapons rushed into the exhibit hall in Caracas and, in front of numerous visitors, mainly high school seniors and their teachers, grabbed Cezanne's "The Bathers," Braque's "Still Life With Pears" and two still lifes painted by Picasso and Gauguin. One of the attackers loudly announced to the frightened public that they were taking these pictures not because they were common thieves. The objective of their attack was the liberation of Venezuelan petroleum from Yankee imperialism. "We shall return these paintings unharmed when we win!" he stated, hoping to gain sympathy and admiration and, above all, to publicize this extravagant action. As we know, Venezuelan petroleum was not liberated by this action but the wish of the isolated radicals to make the front pages of domestic, French and other newspapers was satisfied.

The same trend of gaining as much publicity as is possible may be traced throughout the activities of separatist groups such as "Liberation Movement of the Jura" in traditionally "peaceful" Switzerland, the "Liberation Tigers" of Sri Lanka, the kidnapping and murder of people by the West German "Red Army faction," and the raids of the Brazilian extreme-left "national liberation action" groups.

Desire for publicity as well as readiness to cater to such desires are easily seen in many events related to the seizure of hostages. The seizure of OPEC members during the December 1976 Vienna Conference was typical. The members of the international terrorist group which perpetrated it stipulated as a condition for the release of their victims the broadcasting of an ideological statement on Austrian radio and television. The condition was willingly met by the authorities for, according to the specialists, the publication of the text, written in a pseudo-revolutionary jargon by extreme leftists of the Maoist variety, lowered the degree of sympathy for left-wing forces and directly "worked" for the rightists.

The thirst for publicity on the part of ultraleftist extremists has reached such a height that two or three different groups, including even nonexistent ones, have taken credit for a single terrorist act. This was manifested, in particular, in the action of the Breton separatists on 26 June 1978. Extreme leftists previously

totally unknown to the French tried to claim credit for the explosion at the Palace of Versailles which destroyed much of great cultural value. A "revolutionary workers group" and a "group for the struggle against international unemployment" persistently disputed authorship in the case of the "Versailles exploit." The French bourgeois publications tried to depict them as "communists," "Red" or "under Moscow control."

The same "indoctrination of the public" is clearly visible in the actions described sensationally by the bourgeois press in 1979, a year "rich" in cases of terrorism, such as the murders of policemen in Athens by the "June-1978 group" and the numerous bomb explosions in the agrarian reform area of the Portuguese province of Alentejo (many of them were organized by neofascists who ascribed "authorship" to leftist extremists).

This was also the goal of the Turkish terrorists as they shed blood on the streets of Istanbul, the extreme-leftist separatists as they organized group rallies in India's northeastern districts and the extremists of the "new people's army" who exploded hand grenades during the Easter Sunday mass in Davao in the Philippines in April 1981. Yet, however different the specific circumstances of these and similar actions may seem, each one of them invariably becomes a small political "stick" used by the right-wing forces. To one or another extent, virtually all of them are described in an anticommunist and anti-Soviet spirit, accompanied by noisy campaigns and shouts of "USSR involvement" in extreme-leftist activities. This offers the right-wing forces a convenient opportunity to formulate political demands for "firm measures," "strong government" and further restriction of the already curtailed civil rights of the working people, gained by them in the course of an intense class struggle. Cooperation between the right-wing press and the pseudorevolutionaries is aimed at dividing the labor movement. Furthermore, the leaders of extreme-left groups, deprived of a mass social base, see in the activities of bourgeois mass information media the opportunity for converting their small and divided organizations (at least on paper) into "powerful underground armies," "fronts" and "brigades" with frightening names. "Armed propaganda" has assumed yet another function: the consolidation of groups frequently unrelated to each other or even unaware of the existence of each other. Using the pretext of secrecy, ambitious extreme-leftist leadership reports neither the number of groups nor the number of members. With the help of such publications they imply that their organizations are "large," "widespread" and "have their own people everywhere." Ultimately the fraud is exposed but in the period of activity of the "armed propaganda," this illusion is maintained.

The "armed propaganda" phenomenon, which gained the support of big right-wing newspaper syndicates, radiobroadcasting corporations and television companies, grew out of this common interest. As early as the 1960s, when the alliance between extreme-leftist currents in the capitalist countries and the bourgeois mass information media became a fact of political reality, the need to explain this initially unstructured alliance arose. Its advent was represented as one of the costs of the scientific and technical revolution and it was suggested that it be tolerated as an unavoidable evil resulting from the "benefit of the right to information." Marshall McLuhan, the famous Canadian information specialist, ascribed to radio and television direct and absolute responsibility for the explosion of extreme leftist violence. In his view, the dynamic character of these

media is the reason for the ceaseless and deliberate fabrication of increasingly more sensational news. Whereas in the past such escalation was associated with violations of the norms of decency and morality, in the 1970s, according to McLuhan, the electronic media became a sufficient force to encourage the extreme left to organize political pseudo-events involving real blood and real death. From uncensored abuse, nudism and adultery in public, represented as "political protest" and willingly broadcast live on radio and television, ultraleft extremism advanced to violence as a means of political publicity for the pseudorevolutionaries.

After McLuhan this "convenient" viewpoint was adopted by Louis (Eren), a columnist for the London TIMES. In idealizing electronics, he has classified among the reasons for the expansion of extreme-left terrorism today, along with the development of fast air transportation and the appearance of new portable weapons systems, the creation of a system of television satellites. In his theory, they guarantee the fast and extensive publication of terrorist actions and popularize the "revolutionary" activities of small and scattered groups claiming the role of "vanguard."

However, such technocratic arguments and conclusions lack important logical links. Extreme leftists do not own controlling stock in companies operating the expensive systems of electronic journalism and news dissemination. They are not represented on corporation boards which dictate news policy to radio and television stations, newspaper syndicates and news agencies. Nevertheless, terrorist groups interested in publicity easily "leak" information of their activities to the big press. Any explosion, fire or gunshot in the streets is not simply "news" but rather a secret lesson in which the technology of terrorism is explained to the last detail. The terrorists themselves are depicted as "strong personalities" or modern "Robin Hoods" who experience violent feelings inaccessible to the ordinary citizen.

The neo-Freudians have joined the chorus of bourgeois theoreticians who are trying to provide a "psychological" interpretation of this phenomenon with discussions about the "innate aggressiveness" of man. "The world comes to us," the Argentine M. Grondon writes, "only when the last war has exhausted the aggressive madness. Man is not peace-loving. Occasionally he rests and describes this as peace... Each generation will taste the wine of violence after which, sated, it will rest."

Dozens of "serious" books and hundreds of articles published in thick journals are the result of the "theorizing" of such bourgeois interpreters. Their authors search for the "truth" from positions of hypocritical humanism, for the reaction finds it extremely advantageous to encourage the wave of leftist terrorism, letting it be known that the culprits who promote violence and use it for their political objectives are leftists--communists or revolutionaries to whom any kind of humanity is alien. This type of pseudoscientific study depicts nightmarish "civil wars" and "guerrilla terrorism" which is "disseminated throughout the world by 'Marxist-Leninists' who, participating in a 'global conspiracy,' are trying to impose upon mankind their ideology and 'totalitarian' rule." This was proclaimed with academic ponderousness by David Jordan, a professor at the University of Virginia. Clearly risking his scientific reputation, he categorically claims that "terrorists supported and trained by the communists...have undertaken to establish a Marxist-Leninist state." He is seconded by Brian Flowers, rector of the Imperial

College in London, who has expressed the belief that the desire of terrorist groups to cause a profound psychological impact could lead them to the use of nuclear explosives. In his view, this is possible as a result of the increased production and loss of fissionable materials in the Western "nuclear" powers.

Naturally, the bourgeois theoreticians and practical workers do not mention their class interest in an alliance with ultraleftist extremism. Furthermore, they hide it behind statements on freedom of the press and competition among printed organs which, in a struggle for audiences, hasten to publish any thrilling or spicy sensation, although aware of the social consequences of such publications. However, it is precisely class interest that motivates the owners of mass information media in parcelling out and orchestrating the "armed propaganda" of the extreme left. This is evident also when such materials are no longer politically useful to those who dictate news policy. The class instinct of the management of the West German Bertelsmann publishing concern was instantly sharpened in 1978 when the question arose of publishing the book "Masters of the Dawn" by the famous writer (Chotevitz). In this novel the author describes without embellishment how under the banner of the struggle against the evil of anarcho-terrorism, the steadily expanding police and repressive apparatus of the FRG persecutes differently thinking people, above all citizens with progressive or leftist beliefs. A member of the concern stated that the novel could not be published "because of literary, legal and political considerations."

The observance by the bourgeois information media of the unwritten contract on covering the pseudorevolutionary activities of the extreme left has brought about the paradox of duplication of terrorist groups. Each of them exists in two hypostases: the one in reality and the other on television screens, in newspaper columns and on radio programs. Virtually everyone in the United States is familiar with the symbol of the glorious "Symbionese Liberation Army" which is a seven-headed cobra, and which was printed in millions of copies. Every day the people heard the threats and ultimata of this "army" broadcast by the commercial stations in San Francisco and its suburbs. At most the "army" consisted of 12 people and after the arrests and sentencing of most of its members, by 1975 only three were free. However, the spicy details of the sexual and drug experiments of the "army" gave the group the halo of notoriety and mystical romanticism in its second, its television-newsprint life. The history of Patricia Hearst, kidnapped by the "Symbionese," contained a classical selection of "hot" topics: a young and beautiful girl, rich parents, great malefactors, a shoot-out in a bank robbery, the mysterious transformation of the heiress of millions of dollars into a "Red guerrilla" and the trial with a mass of exciting details.

Bourgeois propaganda finds in the numerous and extravagant actions of the pseudo-revolutionaries an effective means for influencing the mentality of the petit bourgeois. This is a significant reason for the coincidence of the interests of extreme-left terrorism with those of the ruling class in the contemporary capitalist countries.

The second reason is found in the very interpretation of events related to the struggle against terrorism. The bourgeois press has found an inexhaustible source of emotionally potent information which creates a halo of heroism around the heads of the antiterrorist police units of its countries. The features of "bravery,"

"scorn for danger" and "calm in critical situations" are ascribed not only to the terrorists but to those who hunt them. This propaganda line, started in the United States during prohibition, glorified the police and the FBI as "firm" and "incorruptible" fighters against the gangsters, doing a great deal to draw the halo of sinister romanticism around the gangsters themselves. Subsequently, this line was extended by mystery novels which became a part of the "mass culture" of bourgeois society. However, that which 20 years ago was merely the fantasy of writers straining their imagination to create James Bond-type characters is now reality. The newspapers are filled with reports reminiscent of wartime communiques. We see an abundance of military metaphors and pictures of snipers wearing bullet-proof vests. This converts the police into "dedicated knights" defending the "democratic rights" of the people, rights which are actually nonexistent.

The third reason and, possibly, the most important one in the fraternal unity between extreme-left "armed propaganda" and bourgeois mass information media is the anticommunist trend in everything accomplished by both parties. In this case the thesis that socialist countries "support" extreme-left terrorism is particularly exaggerated. In recent years the bourgeois press has regularly published claims that the Soviet Union is financing the "Red Brigades" operating in Italy. The communist attitude toward terrorism has been consistently negative. As early as the 19th century, after the German socialists mounted reprisals in answer to the emergency law and the German anarchists Johann Most and Wilhelm Hasselmann promoted the idea of "action propaganda" which called for violence and terror, K. Marx sharply criticized such views. The idea of "action propaganda" as understood by Most and Hasselmann was subsequently criticized by V. I. Lenin as well (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 6, pp 48, 567). According to Marx the weapon of criticism cannot be replaced by the criticism of weapons; physical force must be countered by physical force. However, the following question could be asked: is the terrorist "weapons criticism" the kind of physical force which can bring down the armed bourgeois state? Marx answered this question in the negative. "The communists know quite well," F. Engels wrote in turn, "that all types of conspiracies are not only useless but even harmful" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 4, p 331).

A new round in the development of the idea of "action propaganda" was the "loud preaching of terrorism" adamantly encouraged by the Russian S. R. at the turn of the century. In Lenin's political-psychological evaluation, this promotion developed in the workers masses the "harmful illusions" that terrorism "makes politicians think even against their will," and that more effectively than months of oral propaganda, terrorism can change the views...of thousands of people regarding revolutionaries and the meaning (!!) of their activities," that it is able to "instill new strength in those who hesitate, who are discouraged or stricken by the sad outcome of many demonstrations," and so on. "Such harmful illusions," Lenin wrote, "can lead only to the quick disappointment and weakening of the efforts to prepare the pressure of the masses in favor of autonomy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 6, p 376). The draft resolution for the Second RSDWP Congress, which was drafted by Lenin, reads: "The congress firmly rejects terrorism, i.e., the system of isolated political assassinations, as a means of political struggle...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 7, p 251).

The S. R. backed their theoretical views with propaganda and agitation activities, combined with specific acts of terrorism. This is confirmed by the proclamation "To All Subjects of the Russian Tsar" and "To the Entire Working People From the Party of Social Revolutionaries," issued by the combat organization and the S. R. Central Committee the day following the assassination of Sipyagin, minister of internal affairs, by Balmashov, a student at Kiev University, on 2 April 1902. The deliberate combination of extreme-leftist S. R. terror with propaganda, systematically carried out for a period of 9 years, through 1911, as we know, failed to yield the desired results. "...Individual terrorist attempts are inexpedient means of political struggle," Lenin emphasized ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 49, p 312).

Lenin's assessment of extreme-left terrorism is just as valid today to the world communist and workers movements. Let us recall that as early as the 1940s, i.e., before the modern means for the dissemination of news with unparalleled speed existed, the workers movement had faced the danger of such an alliance and, relying on Lenin's conclusions, assessed it accurately. The Communist Party of Chile Central Committee was forced to expel from the party L. Reynozo, Central Committee secretary in charge of organizational affairs, for pursuing the adventuristic policy of so-called "direct action." The shock groups he created raided bakeries and distributed free of charge bread to the population in the neighborhood. "Such a policy," L. Corvalan wrote, "hindered the struggle of the masses, replacing it with a struggle waged by small groups. It isolated the party, hindered the efforts to legalize the party and contributed to reprisals, thoughtlessly multiplying the number of casualties of police raids." The cheap popularity on which L. Reynozo and his followers relied and which was willingly created by the bourgeois press led to discrediting the ideas of communism and the true objectives of the communists. The Chilean Communist Party Central Committee considered such activities treasonable. However, Reynozo's ideological heirs did not moderate and, with their irresponsible calls for civil war against the Allende government, actually helped the Chilean reaction to carry out its coup d'etat. Particularly active in this respect was LUCHA OBRERA, the newspaper of the Chilean Trotskyites.

The communist parties have always firmly and systematically condemned the "theoretical" substantiations of the usefulness of "armed propaganda" to the cause of the working class. Carlos Mariguella himself was sharply criticized. In the opinion of those who knew him, although he was perfectly honest and totally dedicated to the idea of liberating the people from exploitation and exploiters, he also underestimated the importance of political parties and scorned all work among the masses. He was expelled from the Brazilian Communist Party in 1967 for his errors and factional activities.

Following Mariguella, the heads of other extreme-leftist groups began to set up their own "theoretical foundations" by "improving" details and "deepening" the concept of "armed propaganda." His influence was clearly felt in the formulation of an instruction by the leadership of the "Weathermen," the American extreme-leftist terrorist group, to the rank and file of their organization. The latter were instructed to do everything possible to provoke the police to attack them in the presence of newspaper, radio and television reporters in order to gain screen exposure and with it the sympathy of the public at large.

The "theoretical" elaboration of problems of "armed propaganda" by the leaders of extreme-leftist movements was carried out and is continuing under the influence of two factors: the activities of the bourgeois interpreters of problems of violence and the syndrome of the distorted perception of themselves which rules the pseudorevolutionary groups.

The effect of the second factor--the syndrome of a distorted perception of themselves and of their role in the contemporary world--is manifested in the inclination of members of extreme-leftist groups to adopt an exaggerated view of their own significance in terms of the destiny of society and the groundless classification of themselves--the "militant minority"--among the spokesmen for the interests of the exploited majority. A peculiar pathological state of mind in the members of extreme-leftist groups is manifested also in giving a psychological interpretation to the ideological reasons for their activities and behavior on the level of a "self-awareness" which, allegedly, is enhanced by the commission of disgusting actions of cruelty, for which reason such actions are considered "proper, necessary and justified." The pathological nature of this perception is found in their imaginary targets or, more specifically, in its political irrationality and actual pointlessness, unless we consider the strictly irrational although thoroughly concealed reliance on blackmail and extortion. This feature was remarked even by some bourgeois investigators at the beginning of the 1970s, when they were absolutely amazed by the desire of the extreme leftists "to mount a revolution without objectives and theories, in the hope that such an objective might arise in the course of the revolution."

As if predicting the possibility that the left-wing "infantile disease" will turn into an epidemic of extreme leftism and of accusing communism of having originated such a dangerous phenomenon, Lenin formulated quite clearly the idea that "violence against people has no place in our ideals" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, p 122). Unable to refute this precise and uncompromising stipulation, the bourgeois sociologists and political experts engage in ideological forgery by dumping in a single heap antisocial elements, different varieties of terrorists, hippies and drug addicts who procure money for themselves by pretending to be "revolutionary" overthrowers of the bourgeois order, and true revolutionaries who are engaged in the armed struggle for the liberation of the peoples of their countries. The bourgeois propaganda machinery is equating forced revolutionary violence on the part of the exploited masses toward the exploiters and the highly antisocial behavior of criminal and semicriminal elements who engage in open banditry, robbery and the kidnapping of people for ransom for a purported political purpose.

Objectively, "armed propaganda" is harmful to the working class and its parties. Terrorism causes real harm to the very cause it allegedly defends. Marxist researchers have noted that it divides revolutionary ranks, leads to alienation from the masses and the turning to right-wing forces, while its propaganda, in the final account, serves the imperialist bourgeoisie and its allies in the struggle against the working class. Fernando Nadra, the Argentine publicist, has bluntly stated that "In reality, as a method terrorism has nothing in common with Marxism.... It is the opposite of our scientific doctrine of the world, society and revolution."

The communists exposed definitively the efforts of the bourgeois propaganda machinery to make use of leftist extremism in promoting anticommunist hysteria. Delegates to the 23rd French Communist Party Congress spoke of the need for a decisive struggle against anarchic pseudoleftism, emphasizing that under contemporary conditions it is an objective ally of the reaction. The report by E. Berlinguer, secretary general of the Italian Communist Party, delivered at the 15th Congress of Italian Communists, mentioned the need to increase the struggle against leftist extremism.

In connection with the energizing of the terrorist groups calling themselves the "25 April Popular Forces" in Portugal last spring, the Communist Party of Portugal Central Committee Plenum passed a special resolution which stated that "Any act of terrorism committed allegedly in the interest of the working people strengthens the reaction." The Communist Party of Portugal Central Committee called upon the people s masses to struggle against the antinational policy of the government strictly within the framework of the constitution and democratic legality. The majority of local political commentators have agreed that hiding behind so-called "people's forces" are reactionary elements who are trying to undermine the political stability and lay the blame for this on the left-wing democratic forces and the Communist Party of Portugal. "There should be no doubt in our minds that leftist provocation goes hand in hand with right-wing counterrevolutionary provocation," was the way A. Cunhal, the leader of the Portuguese communists, concluded one of his speeches.

In his work "Against a Misleading Campaign," Orestes Guioldi, a veteran of the Argentine and international communist movements, wrote frankly of the communists' belief that extreme-leftist terrorism is politically harmful. In his view today, as at the turn of the century, revolutionary changes in the capitalist countries will be the result of the activities and energy of millions of people rather than of the adventuristic actions of a minority, even if such a minority resorts to the services of bourgeois media for the mass manipulation of public opinion.

The technocratic sophistries of bourgeois political experts who trace the "armed propaganda" of the extreme left back to the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution or the arguments of the neo-Freudians on the alleged innate aggressiveness of man, creating a lack of adequate information, quite deliberately ignore the profound ideological-political and moral crisis in the capitalist society. Yet this is precisely the main political reality which triggers contemporary terrorism, which blossoms in the soil of the mentality of the "disoriented intellectual or the beggar, rather than the proletariat" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 5, p 378).

Naturally terrorism, as practiced by the extreme left or extreme right, is triggered by the crisis in the capitalist society, a value crisis, as well as its irrational development. The constant tension supported by violent conflicts is useful only to the interests of the ruling class. Only thus can the field of activity of the democratic forces be limited and the omnipotence of the industrial-financial oligarchy be preserved. Just as inflation has become an instrument for the redistribution of added value in favor of monopoly capital, terrorism has become an instrument for the redistribution of political power to the benefit of the ruling elites and the detriment of democratic forces.

Equally deliberate is the failure of the apologists of "armed propaganda" among the theoreticians of ultraleftist extremism to mention that as a political current, throughout its entire existence, it has provided nothing but general big and meaningless statements. "Reading today the rich pathos of articles in ZNAMYA TRUDA on the heroes of S. R. terrorism," Lenin wrote as early as 1907, "one unwittingly thinks the following: your terrorism, gentlemen, is not the result of your revolutionism. Your revolutionism is limited to terrorism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 16, p 166). The leader of the October Revolution might have written these words today! As in the past, extreme leftism today is no serious danger threatening the foundations of bourgeois society. However, ultraleftist extremism in its various disguises can draw the toiling masses, particularly the young people, away from the class struggle better than anything else, channeling their energy in a false direction and thus dividing the labor movement. This was and remains the main reason for the notorious alliance between the extreme left, on the one hand, and the bourgeois mass information machinery, on the other.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

LET US MASTER THE LENINIST WORK STYLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 97-105

[Review of the book "Izbrannyye Rechi i Stat'i" [Selected Speeches and Articles] by K. U. Chernenko. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 679 pages]

[Text] The noteworthy tokens of real socialism are a dynamic social life, the saturation of the period with the creative accomplishments of the toiling masses and the confident progress from one five-year plan to another. The 26th CPSU Congress gave a new powerful impetus to this progress. It developed the strategic line of the 24th and 25th congresses and provided accurate and clear answers to the basic problems which faced our society at the beginning of the 1980s.

The CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress, delivered by Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, became an outstanding document of our time. The party members, all Soviet people and our foreign friends justifiably describe it as an all-embracing program for the building of socialism and communism and for the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress. It is of tremendous theoretical and practical importance. It is also a model of scientific development of the main problems of the country's economic and social development and improvements in the management of the national economy.

Each new stage in the history of Soviet society is related to the party's energetic organizational work. In striving for successes in various sectors of economic and cultural construction and in improving the level of economic management, together with the working people and as they lead them, the party members are laying the foundations for new achievements in all areas of social practice.

Such is the case today as well, after the 26th CPSU Congress, when tremendous work has developed in the country for the implementation of everything planned by the people and the party.

Such assignments are comprehensive and complex and historical in terms of their scale. Their implementation calls for the mobilization of all forces and resources at the disposal of the Soviet state. Naturally, particularly strict requirements are formulated regarding the standard, quality and work style of the party itself, of the political vanguard, of the leader and manager of the developed socialist society.

In recent years problems of improving the style and ways and means of party work have been given a profound creative development in decisions of party congresses,

CC CPSU Central Committee Plenums, and works by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidum chairman, and of other party leaders. Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CC CPSU Politburo member and CC CPSU secretary, considers a broad range of such problems in the anthology of his articles and speeches.

The work covers a 10-year period in the author's activities. In terms of the number of most important domestic policy and international events, this relatively short time segment plays a considerable role in the life of the party and the country. It is as though these 10 years have compressed within themselves the energy of our growth under the powerful influence of the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses, the labor intensity of the 9th and 10th Five-Year Plans and our rising influence on the course of global developments.

The author's works cover a wide range of problems which, however, lead to the firm conclusion that whatever aspects of party work may be discussed--communist upbringing, perfecting the party and state apparatus, improving the mechanism of national economic management or the international activities of the CPSU--the main topic, the style of party work, can be felt whatever the subject. The Leninist style, K. U. Chernenko writes, is the greatest party resource which enables it to guide the Soviet society successfully.

The author describes the basic aspects of the Leninist style of work: ties with the masses, scientific approach, unity between theory and practice, revolutionary scope, organization and efficiency, collective management, control and supervision of execution, and so on. At the same time, he considers each of these aspects not as a separate static concept but as organically interlinked with the others, i.e., in the course of the type of dynamic and creative application and manifestation which make the Leninist style a powerful party weapon, converting it into the science and art of political guidance of society.

In developing this thought K. U. Chernenko emphasizes that enthusiasm for a single arbitrarily chosen stylistic feature to the detriment of others, which are no less important or necessary, inevitably leads to considerable losses in practical work and lowers the effectiveness of organizational efforts. Thus, by raising efficiency to an absolute level we could turn it into unprincipled practicalism; collective leadership turns into empty arguments; scorn for the scientific approach leads to subjectivism; the separation of theory from practical tasks results in scholastic philosophizing and so on.

The style of party work, the author insists, is not a sum total of ready-made universal prescriptions for all cases in life but a live, a creative method. The party is always concerned with the comprehensive development of all its aspects and features in the course of constructive activities.

On the basis of a thoughtful study the author reaches the conclusion that at the present stage "The style of party management is a many-faceted and profound social phenomenon whose purpose is the revolutionary reorganization of society. It is a specific mechanism for the implementation of the objective law of the growth of the leading role of the party in the communist construction process" (pp 458-459).

K. U. Chernenko considers many aspects of the style of work through the lens of the activities of the administrative apparatus. This is legitimate, for under developed socialist conditions the management system is a complex mechanism in which the organs of the party, the state and the public organizations interact harmoniously. As the leading and guiding force of society the party regulates this interaction. It skillfully directs the work of the components of the administrative apparatus which must carry out their specific functions without blending with each other or substituting for each other. This apparatus works harmoniously and purposefully under the party's guidance.

The party apparatus plays an important role in the management system. It is one of the main links which insure the connection between the party committee at any level and the state and economic organs, public organizations, party members and all working people. It is a necessary instrument in the party's leadership. "This apparatus," the author stresses, "has merged with the party into a single entity. As the role of the CPSU, as the leading and guiding force of our society rises, so do the role and significance of the activities of its apparatus" (p 384). It is with its help that the party pursues its political line, implements the plans, sums up acquired experience and supervises the implementation of party decisions. It is very important for the party apparatus to work efficiently and purposefully, strictly according to its assigned functions.

In this connection the author considers the important problem of the nature of the interaction among party, state and economic organs in the management process and the need for a clear demarcation between their activities. The confusion of functions and the replacement of the state or economic apparatus by party organs lead to undesirable complications.

In the course of its political management of society the party does not set itself the task of interfering in the operative affairs of governmental or economic organs. It focuses its main efforts on work with cadres, increasing its exigency toward them, insuring the efficient organization of control of execution and developing the activeness of party members and all working people. And if despite this the party committee assumes the burden of any given economic organ, one way or another it loses the opportunity of carrying out its political and organizational role to its fullest extent.

The Leninist requirement of making a clear distinction among the fields of activity of party, state and economic organs remains inviolable under developed socialist conditions. Furthermore, it becomes particularly important with the growing leading role of the party. "The task," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized, "is properly to combine party work with economic management. This is an art which one must learn in the course of party work...."

Achieving a full mastery of this art is no simple matter. It requires extensive knowledge, persistence, patience, party training and rich practical experience. Unfortunately, far from all party cadres have mastered this art. We come across frequent cases of bureaucracy and open interference on the part of individual party workers in the current operative activities of the soviet and the economic apparatus.

Frequently problems which must be resolved by soviet or economic organs are submitted for the consideration of party committee bureaus and secretariats. In reviews of reports submitted by economic managers the greater emphasis is put on production problems. Naturally, the party committees have the right to discuss them. Furthermore, this is frequently imposed by reality. The essence, however, consists of the positions on the basis of which such discussions are held and the points on which attention is focused.

For example, it frequently becomes clear that the reason for the chronic lagging of enterprises and the nonfulfillment of the state plan is the insufficient personal responsibility of managers who are party members, low discipline, and inability to organize the work of the collective. Unfortunately, this aspect of the matter, which characterizes the work style of the manager and which is directly related to the outcome of production plans, is not always given a principled party assessment (see p 487).

At the same time, the personnel of party committees frequently assume responsibility for the solution of economic problems: they engage in extensive correspondence on matters of material and technical procurements, shipments, raw material deliveries and so on. This is frequently done at the expense of systematic study and work on major economic and social problems, dealing seriously with cadre upbringing and paying greater attention to the activities of primary party organizations. Furthermore, some party workers gradually become accustomed to this style and consider it normal. In turn, economic managers sometimes willingly let party organs assume the solution of their current problems, i.e., try to insure themselves against possible failures in their work or conceal their inability to manage effectively. In the final accounting, the people become involved in unnecessary coordination or paper shuffling and fall prey to solving current problems to the detriment of basic ones.

Reality has shown that today problems of improving the management system and insuring efficient interaction of party, soviet and economic organs and their apparatus assume prime importance. The 26th CPSU Congress considered improvements in the economic mechanism one of the necessary prerequisites for the growth of public production and improvement of work quality and one of the most important tasks of the party's economic policy in the forthcoming period. Today, when the congress has called for completing the conversion to a focus on intensive economic development, each unit of the management mechanism and the mechanism as a whole must work in an efficient, organized and rhythmical manner.

K. U. Chernenko's book and especially his reports to the all-union conferences of party workers, published for the first time, pay great attention to the reaching of party decisions and to work with documents. This is understandable, for there is no sector of party management unrelated to the drafting and execution of decisions. In the final account, the organizing and mobilizing influence of a party document depends on its nature, on whether or not it is able to formulate the position of the party organization efficiently, clearly and specifically, and to mark the way of progress. In developing this thought the author emphasizes that the documents drafted by the CPSU Central Committee offer vivid examples of the Leninist approach to party solutions. Each of them offers a truly scientific and dialectical analysis of facts and phenomena of social life and contains the

practical experience of many party organizations and labor collectives. The CC CPSU decrees arm the party and the people with a clear and efficient action program. This is the source of their strength.

In the course of the major, thorough and serious work involved in the drafting of a party decision we must always remember that each word and each formulation must be weighed. They must be noted for their impeccable accuracy, brevity and political emphasis. The more thoroughly planned and better prepared the problem is, the more meaningful and specific its solution becomes. Errors made in the drafting of the document or inadequate substantiation of recommendations may complicate and hinder its implementation.

The implementation of a decision is directly related to control over its execution. K. U. Chernenko's book pays considerable attention to control, this tried means of party organizational activities. Its effectiveness greatly depends on the ability to coordinate, organically to combine control from above by the superior party organs with control from below by the primary party organizations and the labor collectives.

Under present conditions, when the volume of work and functions of the party and state apparatus are broadening, control assumes a comprehensive nature: it involves gi ing practical aid and assistance to execution of supervision, summation and utilization of progressive experience and of effective means of work. In other words, control of execution is essentially inseparable from direct organizational work for the implementation of one or another directive. At the same time skilled, specific, objective and impartial control contribute to the strengthening of executive discipline and enhance the individual responsibility of the worker for his assignment.

The author emphasizes that control over the implementation of decisions means not simply to recognize shortcomings and omissions but, above all, to mobilize the people for the elimination of still encountered obstacles. In the final account, the purpose of control is to insure unity between decision and implementation and to prevent possible errors and incomplete work. The organizational efforts of the party and state apparatus must be channeled directly along this line.

It is thus that many party committees act. They consider control of execution an inseparable link in the single process of organizational-political work. Cases in which control is reduced merely to a formal investigation "by everyone of everyone" or needless harrassment of workers and efforts to find only negative sides or examples are being eliminated with increasing firmness. Today priority is given to the task of reaching the core of matters, carefully finding everything that is positive and defining the roots and reasons for shortcomings, to help in their elimination and to encourage in the collective an atmosphere of confidence, efficiency and creative feeling.

The strength and secret of the Leninist style reside in profound and systematic work with people. To work like Lenin means to be sensitively aware of and to express clearly the will of the masses and to feel the pulsebeat of the people's life. Constant close ties with the masses are the core of the party's leadership,

without which the concept of a Leninist style is inconceivable. K. U. Chernenko deals extensively in his book with this matter, one of the basic issues of party work.

The author emphasizes that the conscious and purposeful creativity of the masses represents a profound inner source for the progress of the socialist society and the all-round growth of the people. All of our party's activities are characterized by inexhaustible faith in the creative possibilities of the working people and the desire to involve them in active participation in the building of a new life (see p 320). To this day, under mature socialist conditions, the great words of Lenin remain topical: "Everything we have achieved indicates that we are relying on the most wonderful force in the world--the force of workers and peasants" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 234).

The party values its firm ties with the masses, considering them a priceless possession. At the same time, however, it does not consider the process of strengthening its unity with the people to be completed, requiring no further effort, something established once and for all. All party activities--theoretical and practical, organizational-political and ideological-educational--are aimed at the intensification of such relations and at the further unification of the Soviet people around their communist vanguard.

The strengthening of relations between the party and the working people is a reciprocal process. The disruption of the harmony of such relations leading from the party to the masses and from the masses to the party may bring about undesirable consequences and complications. As we strengthen and develop the unity between party and people in all directions, the author emphasizes, we must increase the meaningfulness, conviction and intelligibility of all forms of information-propaganda and agitation work of party committees. We must not leave questions unanswered or avoid explanations of real difficulties, transient though they may be. Any question left without an answer, any negative phenomenon in our life which has not been interpreted from a party standpoint creates grounds for rumors and false speculations and offers our ideological opponent the opportunity of promoting his own versions of disinformation. The task today is to arm the Soviet person with the most complete and truthful information possible, for example by strengthening his communist outlook, not avoiding so-called "sharp" angles in propaganda work but focusing effort on unresolved problems efficiently and self-critically, and presenting the working people with the open, honest, Leninist truth.

Letters and verbal addresses by the working people to the party organs are important among the relations between the party and the masses. This is one of the most reliable and, therefore, most valuable sources of information regarding "human problems" and the state of affairs in the various sectors of socioeconomic, political and spiritual life of the people.

K. U. Chernenko points out that such letters lift the heart of the Soviet person, his loyalty to communism and his sincere and trusting attitude toward the party and its Leninist Central Committee. The authors of the letters share their concerns, joys and disappointments and formulate specific suggestions on how to

improve our work. Every exposure to such human documents makes us proud of the Soviet person who has reached a profound understanding of national and party interests and tasks (see p 227).

In recent years the level of work of the party committees working with the people's letters has increased considerably. The party organs not only consider the letters and answer them but profoundly study the facts and events they reflect and determine the processes and trends they indicate. Frequently the letters of the working people become the basis for Central Committee decisions. This means that they have a direct impact on the party's policy and help it to formulate the most accurate position possible on basic individual problems. That is why today work with letters and meetings with citizens on private matters are an important, responsible and creative project. It is not merely a question, the author emphasizes, of the fact that the letters are a source of information and an indicator of the mood of the people or a signal of their needs, demands and requirements. Under present circumstances letters have become one of the most important means of participation of the working people in the discussion and resolution of important governmental and social problems and, essentially, one of the means for the involvement of the citizens in the administration of the country.

This is convincingly confirmed by the great attention which the 26th CPSU Congress paid to work with letters. It is noteworthy that immediately after the congress the party's Central Committee passed the decree "On Measures For the Further Improvement of Work With the Letters and Suggestions of the Working People in the Light of the Decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress." The decree stipulates that the party and soviet organs and public organizations, ministries, departments and other economic organs must be strictly guided by the stipulations formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the Central Committee's accountability report to the congress, to the effect that a responsive and attentive attitude toward letters, requests and complaints of the citizens must be considered a duty to the people and the party by every party worker and every manager.

CPSU cadre policy is of tremendous importance in improving the style of party work. K. U. Chernenko repeatedly points this out in his book.

What qualities should the contemporary manager possess? What are the components of his successful work in his assigned sector? What is the main secret, the main science of being a true manager? In answering these questions the author shares with the readers thoughts on many problems related to the selection, placement, upbringing and training of cadres.

He emphasizes that the role of the manager becomes considerably greater, the range of his activities broadens and the level of requirements concerning the qualities he must possess rises with the accelerated pace and increased complexity of the processes of economic and social development of the Soviet society. Possession of specialized knowledge and production skills is insufficient if one is to become a true manager. One needs a deep attraction for the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, firm inner convictions, a militant party spirit, the talent and skills of an organizer and love for work with people.

Considering the present scale of the national economy, however experienced a manager may be, he cannot immediately encompass the entire range of his concerns and deal with all of them by himself. He must seek the views of the collective and of various specialists. He must upgrade their autonomy and responsibility for assignments, develop the creative initiative of the people and create the circumstances in which everyone could show himself in the best possible light. All this is a mandatory requirement of the Leninist work style.

The true manager is characterized by party efficiency. He combines the inseparable unity between word and action, long-range thinking and activities, ability to see the problem in its full dimensions and to seek and find the most fruitful, the optimal means for its solution. Party efficiency categorically conflicts with meaningless harebrained schemes, excessive conferences and senseless paper shuffling.

The modern manager is, above all, the representative of the party in the labor collective. His party maturity determines a great deal, above all the selection of ways and means for achieving set objectives, the moods of the people and their satisfaction with their work. The political and practical qualities of the manager are manifested in his ability to relate his activities to party stipulations regarding the further strengthening of the moral and political unity of our society, the development of socialist democracy and the involvement of the masses in the administration of production affairs (see p 643).

Some of the works in the anthology deal with problems of CPSU foreign political activities. They describe the comprehensive, purposeful and constructive policy pursued by our party in the struggle for peace, disarmament and international cooperation, peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems and detente.

The author, who was a member of the Soviet delegation to the Helsinki Conference on security and cooperation in Europe, pays great attention to this historical event in a number of articles. The anthology includes his work "One Year Since Helsinki," which was widely noted by foreign and Soviet readers, as well as articles on this topic published in the journal MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN'.

The author provides a profound and comprehensive analysis of the increasing role which the CPSU and the Soviet state play in the implementation of the peace program formulated at our party congresses. He convincingly supports the thought that this work is of a long-term and irreversible nature.

The practice of international relations after Helsinki proves the need for goodwill and persistence on the part of all participants in the European conference in order to create an atmosphere of mutual understanding, trust and cooperation. However, the West includes not only allies but opponents of the Helsinki spirit. The latter are trying to wreck the implementation of the agreements which were reached and thus, if not torpedo, at least slow down the detente process. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries favor the firm and systematic implementation of the Helsinki agreements and the pursuit of a policy of peace and mutual understanding among nations (see p 115).

This is entirely and fully confirmed by the foreign policy program formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress. In the current obviously complex circumstances in the world the purpose of this program is the making of a sharp positive turn in the development of global events. It reconfirms that the line of the Leninist party in international affairs is not subject to any fluctuations whatever or circumstantial considerations. It is aimed against war and the forces of militarism and aggression.

However, the author notes, the struggle for peace and for the assertion of the principles of peaceful coexistence does not mean in the least the freezing of the sociopolitical status quo or the elimination of the class struggle. The intensification of the general crisis of capitalism, the aggravation of its social contradictions and the intensified oppression and exploitation of the working people triggered the struggle waged by the broad people's masses, the working class above all, for their rights and for social liberation. The internal development of the capitalist countries itself creates an upsurge in the revolutionary workers movement and the energizing of progressive and democratic forces. One of the noteworthy phenomena today is the growing influence of the communist parties. Proletarian internationalism is a tried weapon of the communist parties and of the entire labor movement. Under the circumstances in which the enemies of the working class and the forces of imperialism and reaction are coordinating their actions on an international scale the systematic observance of the principles of proletarian internationalism is necessary. This is an imperative of the time and a most important prerequisite for the success of the anti-imperialist struggle. Proletarian internationalism, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasizes, is one of the main principles of Marxism-Leninism. "We Soviet communists," he stated, "consider the defense of proletarian internationalism the sacred obligation of every Marxist-Leninist."

The inflexible Leninist political course pursued by our party and its Central Committee, and the consistent internationalism and inflexible aspiration of the party members and the entire Soviet people steadfastly to implement the peace program formulated at the 24th-26th congresses are clearly reflected in K. U. Chernenko's addresses delivered at congresses of fraternal parties and international solidarity meetings.

The book also includes the work "Communists in the USSR. Ideological Foundation. Structure. People and Party," published by the Novosti News Agency in several languages. Its Russian language edition was small, for which reason it is not well-known to Soviet readers.

The principal merit and attractiveness of this work are that it presents complex problems both profoundly and intelligibly. Despite the relatively small size of this work, the author covers the most important aspects of the extensive activities of the CPSU. He begins with an answer to the question of who can be a communist and describes the ideological foundations of the party, its historical mission, the development of its programmatic stipulations and basic norms of party life, the role and place of the CPSU in the political system of Soviet society, its work among the trade unions, the young people and the intelligentsia and so on. Each section of the work contains clear and substantiated answers to questions pertaining to the status and tasks of party members in the USSR.

This work by K. U. Chernenko met with a considerable response among the party members of many fraternal parties. Thus, following its publication in Finnish, Toivo Karvonen, a veteran of the Communist Party of Finland, pointed out that the bourgeois circles invariably rely on the dogmas of all kinds of American "experts in social life," who claim that the communists in the USSR constitute a certain privileged ruling class. On the other hand, many Finnish workers and even communists believe that the status of the CPSU and that of the communist parties in capitalist countries is so different that they have little in common. It is most frequently on precisely such or similar errors that wrong ideas are developed concerning the political structure of Soviet society. The publication of this work, the Finnish communist emphasizes, thus meets an acute need for truthful information of prime importance.

"To us, the Finns," Toivo Karvonen goes on to write, "the objectives and experience of the Soviet communists in their cooperation with the intelligentsia, their work among trade unions and the youth and their attitude toward religion are particularly topical and thought-inspiring. In the book, however, it is a question not only and even not primarily of what ideas it shares with us, communists who work under conditions of capitalism, in our contemporary activities, but of the basis on and manner in which the party members in the USSR constitute the type of force which was able to lead the peoples of the Soviet Union to do such successful work in building socialism in all areas as we are able to note today" (KOMMUNIST No 9, 1979, pp 677-678).

Unquestionably, the work "Communists in the USSR" will be read with the same interest by party activists, agitators, propagandists and people who are preparing themselves for CPSU membership.

To sum up all of this, let us emphasize that K. U. Chernenko's anthology of articles and speeches describes the comprehensive activities of our party and the most topical problems of the style and ways and means of party work under developed socialist conditions.

Convincingly and with the help of extensive factual data the author describes the steady improvement in the activities of the party and state apparatus and of the entire system of political management of society. The author emphasizes and develops the idea that the task of mastering the Leninist work style is not limited in the least to party, soviet or economic managers. The Leninist style is a resource of the broad toiling masses and the party must develop in every party member, in every Soviet person the desire to work as a Leninist.

The author formulates a number of conclusions and recommendations whose practical implementation can have a fruitful influence on the work at all administrative levels. Based on the profound analysis and summation of practical experience, they describe the ways and means for the solution of the complex problems formulated by the party at the present stage. All of this is of major importance in the daily practical work of party committees, party workers and activists.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

CONTINUATION OF PUBLICISTIC LENINIANA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 106-109

[Review by Grigoriy Brovman of the books "Puteshestviye po Leninskoy Adresnoy Knizhke" [A Trip Along Lenin's Address Book] by Yuriy Yurov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 376 pp, and "Portret i Vremya" [Portrait and the Time] by Yegor Yakovlev. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 352 pp]

[Text] Along with literary-artistic Leniniana, in recent years publicistic Leniniana has been developed fruitfully as well. Through its specific means it recreates Lenin's portrait with the complexity of his life and struggle, with its contradictions, difficulties and successes. Today publicistic Leniniana, distinguished by its strictly documentary nature and depth of summations, in accordance with the spirit of the time, is interested mainly in the moral principles of Lenin's character, the moral and political aspects of his work as a leader, the ethical norms governing his behavior and the practice of his relations with people in party and governmental affairs and private associations. This enables the publicist to acquaint the reader with Il'ich's spiritual world, character and comprehensive and exceptionally rich intellectual and emotional personality more completely than before.

In their new books the publicists have chosen different roads to the solution of this creative problem. Yuriy Yurov hit on the good idea of making a study of Lenin's notebook with its individual entries and telegrams which had failed to attract the attention of other researchers. This material, only part of which has been included in the leader's collected works and in the Leninist collections, turned out to be quite rich and deep in terms of both work and domestic matters. An entire chain of events, projects and mutual relations of tremendous historical significance hide behind the names of his fellow workers, friends or acquaintances, listed alphabetically.

The publicist, who studied these notes and followed traces leading to additional data and who met with some of the people still living, mentioned in Lenin's address book or with the children and relatives of others, was able to refine individual pages of the history of the October Revolution and of Vladimir Il'ich's biography. The reader becomes clearly aware of essential details of significant events of those revolutionary times, such as the return to the homeland by Lenin and a group of expatriate Bolsheviks in April 1917, the trip from Razliv to Finland during the Kerenskiy period, the active participation in the work of the headquarters of the Petrograd Military District in suppressing the Kerenskiy-Krasnov counterrevolutionary mutiny in the first days of the Soviet system....

"Only one person among us is familiar with military affairs," said at that time the old Bolshevik Ye. F. Rozmirovich, referring to Il'ich, as she observed his work in the military headquarters of the revolution.

Many such unknown as well as unjustifiably forgotten details of Lenin's life and activities in stormy 1917 and early 1918, from the time of his arrival from voluntary exile through the move of the government from Petrograd to Moscow--it was precisely during that time that Il'ich used this address book--were studied and described by the publicist in his captivating "trip" as he follows the addresses in the book. He has good things to say about Lenin's fellow workers, old Bolsheviks whose names were entered in the address book but not so frequently encountered in our party history literature: Grigoriy and Yelena Usiyevich, Yevgeniy Pervukin, Eyno Rakh'ya, Lidiya Parviaynen, Ivan Belostotskiy, Ivan Prisyagin and Anna Ivanova. The author provides an interesting and fresh description of the party school in Longjumeau, with its Leninist students, Red Officer Day, celebrated for the first time on 24 November 1918, and Il'ich's participation in it. Lenin was late for the Red Square ceremony, for on that Sunday he had already attended a demonstration of railroad workers at the Moscow junction on upgrading labor productivity and strengthening labor discipline. From the balcony of the Moscow Soviet building, in his address to the railroad workers, Lenin said: "Your demonstration on Red Officer Day proves that our Red Army and the working class will be marching hand in hand.."

It would be scarcely possible to describe in a journal review the entire factual data assembled by the author in his book. For example, the reader undoubtedly will be interested in some details of essentially familiar events. Thus, the author cites a line from the address book: "Kshesinskaya, Her Palace."... In this connection he tells the entertaining and instructive story of the attempts by the ballerina (supported by reactionary forces) to regain the premises which housed the most important centers of the Bolshevik Party in the April days of 1917. To this purpose Matilda Kshesinskaya began by personally going to the house she had owned and abandoned. "... Witnesses to the conversation," an eyewitness reports, "became very amused when Kshesinskaya demanded that the upper floor of the premises be vacated. However, she did not cease her efforts, turning to a justice of the peace who, quoting laws of the former Russian Empire, heard the lawyer of the previous owner and resolved that the palace should be returned to her. A bailiff appeared at the house to expel the Bolshevik party organs and V. I. Ul'yanov, who was allegedly living there and who had been listed as one of the defendants in the case. The bailiff's trip ended in total failure: after the seamen, in his words, promised to "let him have it," all that was left for him was to retreat quickly, which he did amidst laughter.... Curiously, Kerenskiy was aware of this entire "case" and the then Menshevik leadership of the Petrograd Soviet insisted on the execution of the court's decision. Here again the conciliationists remained true to their nature.

The heart sinks as we read the section describing the criminal attempt on Lenin's life on 30 August 1918. Here again we come across new facts which show the love of the people for their leader and the deep confidence that Il'ich would soon resume his duties. On 22 October 1918 Vladimir Il'ich delivered his first speech since his recovery at the joint session of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee,

the Moscow Soviet and the representatives of the Moscow trade unions. The speech was received enthusiastically. "Lenin had lost a lot of weight and his voice was weak although it could be heard throughout the huge hall of the House of Trade Unions,..." The report carried by VECHERNYYE IZVESTIYE MOSKOVSKOGO SOVETA stated. "He was having difficulties with his left hand.... It was painful to look at Comrade Lenin speaking." This exclusive printed testimony of Il'ich's first public speech after the attempt is touching in its sincerity and warmth toward the leader. The author has done well to include in his book this forgotten report from those heroic and dramatic times....

In his book "Portret i Vremya," Yegor Yakovlev has resolved his creative problem differently. Unquestionably, this is a successful attempt to recreate the portrait of Lenin the person through the use of publicistic means. He does not seek obscure data or follow the traces of unstudied events of the time. He does not discover new facts or documents. The author relies on published and widely known works by Il'ich himself and the works of A. M. Gor'kiy and N. K. Krupskaya and other contemporaries and fellow workers of the leader. However, the freshness of the approach, the wealth of psychological observations and the vital considerations of the publicist make it possible to have a fresh look at many familiar circumstances of Il'ich's life and activities, the moral values he considered basic and the moral principles governing his attitude toward himself, the revolution and all those who were making it. This is the result of a refined study of historical sources and a bold comparison of facts which may seem to be disparate but which lead to unexpected yet psychologically and logically constant comparisons and the ability to describe the perception of our daily life in its interaction with the past accurately and inobtrusively. Out of all this comes the portrait of the proletarian leader and founder of the first socialist state in the world, of a person filled with humanity and moral beauty.

Let us use the following example to illustrate how this is achieved. In a note to one of his letters to A. M. Gor'kiy, Vladimir Il'ich wrote: "If you do not understand what is going on you can understand the people only...superficially" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 47, p 221). Customarily, this thought is ascribed to works of literature or studies of the character and behavior of a person, the study of the personality and the definition of its spiritual aspect in philosophy, psychology, and so on. Ye. Yakovlev sees in this thought a description of the principles "on the basis of which Vladimir Il'ich built his relations with people and the direct work relations he always established" (p 220).

With the help of facts the author describes the attitude of Lenin the leader toward his revolutionary fellow workers. "His views on the practical qualities of a person...," writes Ye. Yakovlev, "were inseparable from the moral features of the person" (p 221). The morality of a person is revealed through his actions rather than discussions or even public speeches. The true spiritual qualities of a person are revealed in the way he serves his cause, whether direct revolutionary activities or economic work.

Any other assessment of the qualities of a person can be only superficial and, therefore, incomplete or erroneous. "One cannot understand Vladimir Il'ich unless one understands the projects in which he was involved," the author states (p 224).

We know from extensive testimony of Lenin's contemporaries and fellow workers that the standards he applied in rating himself he also applied to the communists surrounding him. Practical revolutionary activities were the criterion on which this assessment was based.

Vladimir Il'ich's character and everything he accomplished, wrote or said are inseparable from the objectives of the struggle he waged. The author cites facts confirming that even Lenin's political opponents could not deny this. Thus, the Menshevik Don said about Lenin that "...No one could be greater than a person who is involved with the revolution 24 hours a day and who has no thoughts other than those about the revolution and who can see the revolution even in his sleep. Just try to deal with such a person" (p 19). Naturally, Lenin had a private life as well but it was inseparable from his public life. "His life had no public and private sides," wrote V. V. Vorovskiy describing Il'ich. "He...was carved out of a single block." However, involved in concerns for the common good, Lenin seemed never to ignore particulars. He never failed to encourage someone in trouble, to be concerned with a sick comrade, or to help materially needy people. This not only did not contradict his total dedication to the overall revolutionary cause but stemmed from it. Raised in a family where N. G. Chernyshevskiy was deeply honored, Vladimir Il'ich remembered his words from the article "Rendezvous of the Russian Person," which described the importance of motivations focused on the "common good." It was on the basis of this viewpoint that the character of Il'ich was molded consistently and purposefully, retaining the moral concepts of the intellectual and democratic Ul'yanov family, enriched by the moral principles of proletarian revolutionary movement and the principles of a Marxist outlook.

The book describes the development of the personality of the proletarian revolutionary, of the leader of the working masses. The author's main focus is the moral aspect of this development. He has been able to describe expressively, without resorting to artistic fiction or allowing himself even the slightest license, the way Lenin's personality developed under the specific historical conditions of his time, the way his new moral concepts were established and the way the ethical norms of true humaneness were firmly manifested in his nature.

Let us recall the following familiar events: in the summer of 1892, in the company of M. T. Yelizarov, Vladimir Il'ich was traveling from Samara to [illegible]n', from which he intended to cross over to the left bank of the Volga in order to go to Bestuzhevka Village, where he had some business to conduct as an attorney. At Batraki Village, Syzranskiy Uyezd, the ferry boat was run by the merchant Aref'yev, who had forbidden his competitors to haul passengers. The boat of anyone who dared to violate the ban was stopped and pulled back by the merchant's steamboat. Vladimir Il'ich was in a great hurry and talked one of the boatmen into taking him across. However, Aref'yev's steamship caught up with the boat, the sailors secured the boat with a gaff and Il'ich and Yelizarov were taken back to the dock. They were forced to wait for the merchant's ferry and, furthermore, to listen to Aref'yev's mockery. D. I. Ul'yanov recalls that, naturally, the people knew that the merchant was acting illegally but neither dared nor wanted to file suit against him. Vladimir Il'ich, however, filed a complaint, charging Aref'yev with taking the law into his own hands, which was punishable with a term in jail. The case was postponed several times, for the merchant refused to answer the

summons of the zemstvo chief. Meanwhile, Vladimir Il'ich persistently demanded that the case be tried, traveling hundreds of versts for this purpose. In the final account, the merchant Aref'yev was jailed.

In connection with this event, Ye. Yakovlev asks: did it make any sense to waste all this time and effort on this case, when the decision to dedicate all time and all effort to the revolutionary reorganization of the entire way of life had already been made? Could it be, the author further asks, that our very premise was wrong? Are we making an effort to consider this episode on the basis of the purpose of Vladimir Il'ich's entire life and to combine this story with Lenin's revolutionary activities? The merchant Aref'yev neither was or could have been a political opponent. He had dared to insult the Ul'yanov dignity as a person. In this case, Vladimir Il'ich acted as a citizen who rises to the defense of his dignity. Generally speaking, we can agree with this interpretation of the matter, although the author's conclusions, in my view, must be refined further.

The way he acted in this situation not only does not conflict with "the purpose of Vladimir Il'ich's entire life" but, on the contrary, is entirely consistent with his revolutionary ideal. It is entirely consistent with the moral features of the future revolutionary and is in harmony with the perception of the world which characterizes Il'ich. Ye. Yakovlev himself writes that "Lenin's exceptionally strong feeling of his own dignity appears to me like a fixed value in the sense that the manifestation of this feeling has always been equally strong throughout the greatly different periods of his life and in terms of his relations with a great variety of people" (p 298). We entirely agree with this view, which justifiably asserts the integrity of Vladimir Il'ich's spiritual world and his consistency and the organic nature of his moral development. Naturally, the observance of the simple norms of morality was part of his moral image.

Il'ich's high moral qualities became particularly apparent in the post-October era, in its first years, when the organization of the new system was blazing a virgin path and when the new and virtually unknown principles of human interrelationships, sanctified by the great ideals of communism, were being established. By collecting, classifying and summarizing many events of Lenin's life and activities at that time the author enables us, the readers, to share in the accurate understanding of all of these events and facts. He considers profoundly each instructive event and asks us to think of how topical such events are today and how important their profound and accurate interpretation is....

The work helps us to acquire a clear idea of Il'ich's position in life, considered through his daily interaction with people in a great variety of situations. Life is complex and varied and cannot be considered merely in terms of an ideal or in terms of presenting a wish as reality. As he dreamed of the future and as he brought it closer through specific actions, Lenin, the greatest of optimists and realists, invariably opposed haste in the solution of any problem, big or small. For example, while hating bureaucracy and working for its fastest possible elimination, Lenin pointed out that "The struggle against bureaucracy will take decades" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 42, p 248). In the last articles he dictated he gave the following advice: "We must immediately come to our senses. We must become imbued with a salutary mistrust of any rash hurry toward progress, any boasting, etc." (Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 390).

Lenin's faith in the triumph of communism was based on the scientific study of social developments, the profound knowledge of Marxism and the close study and summation of the revolutionary-transforming practice of the proletariat and on the experience gained in the course of its struggle for liberation. Convictions developed in this manner were thought out, experienced and tested in theoretical battles and real actions. Lenin's positions were based not on incantations, which he mocked, and not on political rhetoric but on political and economic grounds.

The author cites the following example: at a Sovnarkom meeting, I. I. Radchenko, chairman of the Glavtorf, asked for funds for the construction of barracks at the peat works at the cost of 4,000 rubles each. The representative of the People's Commissariat of Finance objected, stating that no more than 2,000 rubles were necessary. An argument broke out. Meanwhile, Vladimir Il'ich who was exchanging notes with the opposing parties, found out that Radchenko had set up such barracks on several occasions. The representative of the People's Commissariat of Finance, who was asked the same question, answered: "Obviously, I have not." When the discussion ended, Lenin suggested that the questions he had asked be answered out loud Radchenko confirmed that he had built barracks while the representative of the People's Commissariat of Finance, that he had not. In asking for a vote on the matter, Vladimir Il'ich formulated the question as follows:

"We are faced with two motions. The author of the first, who is experienced in the construction of barracks, thinks that building a barrack costs 4,000 rubles; the author of the second, lacking similar experience, suggestes that 2,000 would be sufficient...."

Naturally, the author concludes, the members of the Sovnarkom supported the first motion as would have any one among us in their position.

Proper knowledge, competence, and specific and motivated views were the elements of efficiency which Lenin adamantly demanded of any official, whatever his rank. It was on the basis of such criteria that officials were rated, rather than of assertions of loyalty to common ideals or oaths of infallibility....In this respect Lenin was irreconcilable, stern, exacting and, sometimes, curt. He set the strictest possible standards for himself, for which reason he had the moral right to demand them of others. In this case, as we know, Il'ich was distinguished by a modesty which, as the author writes, "was both a part of his character and the political line followed by Lenin the communist, one of the manifestations of the principles he supported" (p 261). He pertinently reminds us of the fact that in the Ul'yanov family Vladimir Il'ich had become acustomed "to a kind of view of life in which anything considered as a material good made sense to the extent to which it was needed for the satisfaction of man's natural requirements, that spiritual wealth alone could be infinite and that it was only in this area that the desire to acquire and accumulate something was worthy of man" (Ibid.). Lenin's modesty was manifested in each of his actions and thoughts....

This is not an assumed or ostentatious modesty but the natural Leninist norm of life which is organically inherent in a communist. The book "Portret i Vremya" proves this convincingly and vividly, with great publicistic power.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

STUDY OF THE METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF PARTY POLICY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 109-111

[Review by Professor V. Shapko, doctor of historical sciences, of the book "Politika KPSS: Metodologicheskiye Problemy i Praktika" [CPSU Policy: Methodological Problems and Practice] By A. S. Vishnyakov. Mysl', Moscow, 1980, 455 pages]

[Text] Each of the congresses held by our party has been a clear demonstration of the creative force of its Leninist course and has given a new impulse to the further growth of the political activeness of the Soviet people, their confidence in the future and optimism. "We are optimists," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, "because we believe in our party and we know that the path it is pointing out to us is the only true path!"

In this connection the topical nature of works which help the party members and all working people to see more clearly the nature of CPSU policy, the way its scientific substantiation and truly national character are insured and the mechanism of its elaboration and execution, is unquestionable. The recently published study by A. S. Vishnyakov deals directly with such problems. In describing the general methodology of the question, the author proves the essential importance of the dialectical-materialistic concept of the historical process and the Marxist-Leninist theory of the base and the superstructure, the classes and the class struggle and the role of the people's masses and political parties in history and other basic Marxist-Leninist concepts, in the study of the objective nature and role of politics. Their proper application in the specific study of various aspects of social development and reliance on Marxism-Leninism as a single and purposeful theory insure the adoption of a truly scientific approach to politics. It is from such positions that the monograph interprets a number of complex phenomena and processes related to current CPSU political activities.

From the methodological viewpoint the definition of the basic features inherent in politics as a specific social phenomenon is important. Politics, he writes, usually arises on the basis of the requirements of economic progress of a society. It asserts the interests of the dominating class while simultaneously reflecting the influence of the interests of other classes and of the struggle or cooperation among various social forces within the country and in the international arena. The author then characterizes the specific features distinguishing the policy of the working class and its frontranking detachment--the communist party--under socialist conditions. In terms of CPSU policy, the author singles out such features as its scientific nature, strict class approach, principle-mindedness, profound ties linking it with the life of the people, humanism, historical optimism, and

proletarian and socialist internationalism. Put together, the author emphasizes, they "determine the great transforming power of our policy" (p 44).

A considerable part of the monograph deals specifically with the all-round description of these characteristics. The author describes in detail the objective and subjective factors which determine them and their actual manifestation in practical affairs. He pays great attention to the study of the general factors which determine the high reputation enjoyed by CPSU policy and its vital significance in terms of economic and social progress in Soviet society. As we know, they constitute the fact that the party's policy must fully consider the laws governing social development. It must adequately express the basic interests of the people and contribute to the coordination of demands of the different popular strata.

The availability of ideological-theoretical instruments, the ability to apply creatively the basic Marxist-Leninist concepts to the study of a specific situation and the extensive use of acquired experience and recent scientific accomplishments make it possible for the party to penetrate profoundly into the essence of processes occurring in social life, to see their legitimacy and future and successfully to resolve the problems of the building of communism. Hence the scientific substantiation of the party's policy and its realistic nature. Naturally, the party is intolerant of subjectivism and objectivism in political activities. The struggle against them is necessary for the formulation and adoption of accurate political decisions and for their successful implementation. The author studies this problem in particular. He explains the gnosiological and social roots of such deviations and describes the harm they cause to the party's guidance.

In discussing subjectivism, the author criticizes the occasional view that voluntaristic errors may appear only in the center, in the directival and planning organs. He convincingly proves the groundlessness of this view. In order to surmount voluntarism, the author concludes, we must combine the knowledge, experience and efforts of the central and local organs, of the central and local workers (see pp 170-171). In a word, this requires systematic observance of the Leninist principle of democratic centra'ism in the entire system of party and state leadership.

The monograph considers the problem of the proper reflection of the interests of the people in politics in daily party and governmental practice. The author's interpretation of the concepts of interest as a sociological category, developed to a certain extent in our philosophical publications, provides useful practical guidelines. The book defines interest as the manifestation of the actual position of the people in society and of their needs. The attention of the readers is directed to the study of relations among public, collective and private interests under socialism, as being most important in politics.

It is emphasized that unlike the situation under capitalism, with its antagonistic social relations, socialism presumes and insures the strengthening of the social unity of the people. At the developed socialist stage the basic interest of all Soviet people--classes, social groups, nations and nationalities--coincide in their main and essential aspects. Knowledge of such interests, based on scientific accuracy, and their systematic implementation in plants and current economic and

cultural practices are the primary task of the party as the political guide of the people. Its domestic and foreign policy lines are distinguished by their unity. They express the principal and common features which unite all working people and their collectives, organizations and institutions.

However, the author points out, this does not exhaust the problem of interest as a factor in politics. Under mature socialist conditions, as well as common features, classes, social groups, nations and nationalities have specific interests and needs. There are also the individual interests of the members of society. All this must be taken into consideration in politics. The art of leadership consists precisely of the ability organically to combine common and specific interests within a single political course and thereby to insure the implementation of the mandatory socialist law in the ever fuller satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of the working class, kolkhoz peasantry, intelligentsia and all Soviet people. This task assumes exceptional importance today when the objective, as embodied in the basic law of socialism, to quote Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "becomes the center of the party's practical policy directly and immediately."

This reveals yet another aspect of party policy: it not only reflects the people's existing interests and needs but actively contributes to the shaping and development of new interests and needs, whose nature becomes increasingly consistent with the principles of the socialist way of life and of our communist ideals. On a broader level, this becomes a question of the role played by CPSU policy as an effective factor in the communist upbringing of the masses. In the work this aspect is discussed with the help of numerous facts and observations which demonstrate how the moral potential of party policy appears in our life and how it helps us to develop sensible needs, worthy of a harmoniously developed person, to promote high civic-mindedness and political standards among the Soviet people and to assert a healthy moral-political atmosphere in labor collectives.

In this connection, the question of the profoundly democratic nature of the party's political activities is formulated quite legitimately. It is from this viewpoint that the author interprets not only the educational functions of CPSU policy but the mechanisms which govern the formulation and implementation of such policy. With the help of his research data, conclusions and summations, the author convincingly proves that consideration of public opinion and the all-round involvement of the toiling masses in active participation in political affairs and their formulation and implementation represent an inseparable feature of party guidance, based on the very nature of our party, which is the vanguard of the Soviet people, the party of the builders of communism.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

YOUNG PEOPLE IN SCIENCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 111-113

[Review by A. Golubev of the book "Lenin. Nauka. Molodezh" [Lenin. Science. Youth]. Nauka, Moscow, 1980, 495 pages]

[Text] What is the meaning of science in modern society? What is its role in building the communist future? What are the qualities which distinguish the socialist scientist and what character features should the young Soviet person who has decided to dedicate himself to science develop in himself?.... The answers to these (and many other) problems are found in the anthology prepared by the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Komsomol Central Committee. Its publication was timed for the 60th anniversery of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin's speech at the Third All-Russian Congress of the Russian Communist Youth League. The purpose of this work is to prove the great historical leap taken by our country in the development of science and technology by following the way indicated by the proletarian leader, and the qualitative changes which have taken place in social life and in the social consciousness of the people, who made a gigantic cultural revolution under the guidance of the communist party.

The anthology opens with V. I. Lenin's speech "Tasks of the Youth League" and with L. I. Brezhnev's address at the 19 October 1971 All-Union Student Rally, entitled "Let Us Learn How to Work and Struggle Like Lenin," and his speech at the 18th Komsomol Congress on 25 April 1978.

The bibliographic survey of the publications of V. I. Lenin's speech "Tasks of the Youth League," written by V. I. Desyaterik (pp 474-491) is very interesting. We are given not simply all historical reference but an essay on the profound marks which this speech left in the hearts of subsequent generations of Soviet and foreign young fighters for communism.

The scientific strategy of the Great October Revolution and the role which the young people raised within a socialist system play in its implementation are described in the articles by B. N. Pastukhov, Komsomol Central Committee first secretary, "Soviet Youth and Scientific and Technical Progress," and Academician Ye. P. Velikhov, "The Task Remains the Same--To Study!"

The anthology includes articles and speeches addressed to young people by more than 70 outstanding Soviet scientists. They are the legacy left by the older generation to the younger one. At the same time they are an entertaining story about science and scientists, thoughts about practical experience, and directions

and advice to those who are entering the field of science today. Some of these materials have already been published (such as, for example, that of Academician Ivan Petrovich Pavlov, who delivered his famous speech "Letter to the Youth" at the 10th Leninist Komsomol Congress, in 1936). However, they have lost nothing of their power. On the contrary, in the light of past accomplishments and current tasks, they have become even more important and the interest in them even greater.

In his address to the 26th CPSU Congress, L. I. Brezhnev pointed out "Science must be a permanent disruptor of tranquility," showing the areas in which stagnation and lagging have developed and where contemporary knowledge offers the opportunity to move ahead faster and more successfully." The importance of the role which scientists and specialists in all scientific and production sectors play in this matter is understandable.

"...The contemporary specialist," L. I. Brezhnev said, "is a highly cultured person with extensive knowledge. Generally speaking, he is a true intellectual of the new, the socialist society" (p 27). The spirit of the entire anthology is to help the young person to become precisely such an intellectual.

It is a familiar saying that a student is not a container to be filled but a lamp to be lit. Addressing himself to the delegates attending the Third Komsomol Congress, V. I. Lenin asked that the old training method of memorizing be replaced by the ability to acquire the sum total of human knowledge, to relate each separate step of activities to the struggle of the working people for a better future. Academician B. N. Kedrov particularly emphasizes V. I. Lenin's thought that school must develop in young people the ability to formulate communist views by themselves. He emphasizes that we must try to understand by ourselves the most complex problems of social life and that this alone will help us to make our convictions firm.

A section of the anthology is entitled "To Know Means To Win." In the anthology the need of a link between scientific research and practical work is discussed by outstanding soviet scientists. "Closer to Life!" is the main idea by Academician A. N. Bakulev (pp 64-69). "Let Us Master Science and Technology to Perfection," asks Academician A. N. Bakh of the vanguard of the working people, "so that our science may reach a level of which the capitalist countries could not even conceive (see pp 72-73)." "One can and should work on as many abstract problems of science as one wishes. Nevertheless, such work in abstractions must have its roots in the ground, in the specific needs of society," Academician S. I. Vavilov writes. "From the viewpoint of the service of science to the people one should never forget that the purpose of science is to help the state and society as much as is possible. For this reason the Soviet researchers must strive to insure the practical implementation of their scientific results as rapidly and efficaciously as possible. The ability to combine a broad theoretical horizon, general theory and abstraction with healthy practicalism is the best and virtually only means by which science can help the people. The Soviet state needs such science most of all and expects it of its old and young scientists" (pp 77-78).

In fact, the purpose of all the works in the anthology is to provide scientific youth with proper social guidelines and to help the young people to develop a rich

moral awareness which determines an active life stance in accordance with the interests of a society which is building communism. This is the principal value of the anthology.

The part entitled "New Scientific Horizons" deals with the origins and future of scientific and technical progress.

Addressing himself to the delegates to the 18th Komsomol Congress, A. P. Aleksandrov, USSR Academy of Sciences chairman, said: "....The broader your outlook becomes the more you will look at what is around you, read and study, and the more successful you will be in your work and the more will your creativity and initiative develop" (p 124). A captivating panoramic view of accomplishments and tasks at the cutting edge of modern knowledge and practice is opened to the readers. Significantly, the story of all of this is firsthand, told by the creators of big science themselves, the pioneers and the innovators. Here are some of the titles of the works included in the publication: "To the Future Conqueror of the Ocean," by Academician L. M. Brekhovskikh; "Unraveling the Secrets of Nature," by Academician I. M. Vinogradov; "The New Science of the Life of the Soil," by Academician M. S. Gilyarov; "Mathematics Looks to the Ground," by Academician P. Ya. Kochina; "The Romanticism of Scientific Research For Structural Equipment Forms," by Academician N. P. Mel'nikov; "Pathfinders of the Future Generation," by Academician I. V. Petryanov-Sokolov; "The Fertile Blade of Wheat," by Academician V. N. Remeslo; "Machines: Today and Tomorrow," by Corresponding Member K. V. Frolov; "The Scientist and Designer in the Age of the Scientific and Technical Revolution," by Academician A. I. Tselikov; and "Health--A People's Resource," by Academician Ye. I. Chazov. Each story opens, in a popular yet strictly scientific way, a broad field for "Thinking And Searching," as Academician N. M. Emanuel' has entitled his work.

"The scientific and technical revolution covers not only the natural and technical sciences," Academician N. P. Dubinin emphasizes. "It is an historical process which cannot be understood unless we see the connection between its natural-technological and its social aspects, and between the development of science and technology, on the one hand, and the development of society and of the individual, on the other. The individual will develop one-sidedly if only his rational, his logical side is developed. ...It is not easy to neutralize the technocratic influence on man. However, this is necessary in order to avoid standardization, i. e., the destruction of the personality. The broader the spiritual needs become and the freer the person is to make a choice, the less he depends on stereotypes" (pp 175-176).

A necessary prerequisite for the successful development of science is the mastery of its rich experience. "As you move ahead, retain your ties with the preceding generations," Academician A. P. Okladnikov advises the young. "Value the legacy and contribution of your predecessors." (p 251).

"....You, the scientific youth, face endless opportunities and a virgin land of knowledge; plow it with your young strength, raise the banner of Soviet science higher, and glorify with your work your republic and our entire Soviet people!" is the appeal of Ye. K. Kharadze, Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences president (p 337).

The last section of the book is entitled "Sketches of Soviet Scientists." It consists of 37 short essays "on outstanding scientists of the senior generation,

their discoveries and the scientific schools they created" (as stated in the book). The essays are quite lively. However, their quality is uneven and some of them are too superficial for this kind of a work.

The absence of a reference-bibliographic section is regrettable. It would have been particularly pertinent in such an anthology.

As a whole, this does not reduce the great merits of this well-presented book. It is a good and intelligent interlocutor, interesting to people of all ages and occupations. Unquestionably, it will play a positive role in ideological and political-educational work. The young will find it a valuable aid in choosing their vocation.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

NEW DOCUMENTS ON THE HEROISM OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 113-116

[Review by D. Antonyuk of the book "Sovetskaya Ukraina v Gody Velikoy Otechestvenoy Voyny 1941-1945" [Soviet Ukraine in the Great Patriotic War 1941-1945]. Documents and materials in three volumes. Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1980; Vol 1, 556 pages; Vol 2, 520 pages; Vol 3, 592 pages. Editors in chief: V. I. Yurchuk (chairman), Yu. V. Babko, V. F. Vozianov, D. F. Grigorovich, I. S. Grushetskiy, V. V. Gurkin, V. T. Dementiyev, V. I. Klokov, Yu. Yu. Kondufor, A. I. Korniyenko, V. V. Kuz'menko, I. F. Kuras, N. I. Lutsev, A. G. Mityukov, P. K. Musiyenko, V. N. Nemyatyy (deputy chairman), P. T. Tron'ko and A. F. Fedorov]

[Text] The road to victory in the Great Patriotic War--the most difficult and bloody war in the history of mankind--was extremely difficult. An extensive literature on this heroic exploit of the Soviet people has emerged in the postwar years. The publication of documents and materials holds an important position among them.

This three-volume work, which includes 1,097 of the 26,000 documents and materials identified by historians and archive workers, was published on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the victory over fascism. More than one-half the documents are published for the first time. They convincingly prove the leading role and comprehensive activities of the CPSU and of one of its combat detachments--the Ukrainian Communist Party--for the mobilization of the efforts of workers, kolkhoz members and the intelligentsia for the defeat of the enemy. The new documents considerably increase our knowledge of the powerful patriotic thrust of the working people of the Soviet Ukraine, who joined in the struggle against the aggressor.

The documents and materials of the first volume describe the organizational and political work of party, soviet and Komsomol organs and of the local military institutions to insure the implementation of military mobilization plans.

From the very first days of the war the communist party sent a considerable percentage of its leading cadres to the front and to decisive rear sections. Hundreds of thousands of patriots voluntarily joined the ranks of the Red Army. As early as August 1941 more than half the Ukrainian party members were sent to the front.

The document dealt yet another crushing blow to the claims of bourgeois historians, according to which the first two weeks of the Great Patriotic War were an alleged "triumphant march of the German-fascist troops." In reality, as eyewitnesses confirm, from the very beginning of the war, in hard defensive battles, the

Red Army troops and the sons and daughters of all the peoples of the USSR showed their boundless loyalty to the great Leninist cause and displayed mass heroism and self-sacrifice for the freedom of the socialist fatherland. Side by side with the regular troops all working people joined in the struggle against the hated enemy. They were headed by the rayon, city and oblast party committees. In the course of bloody battles the communists--commanders, commissars, political instructors and rank and file soldiers--strong with their ideological convictions and loyalty to the cause of the party and the people, set an example for the troops.

The reports of the political administrations of fronts and political departments of armies confirming the mass heroism of the Soviet troops starting with the very first days of the war, including previously unpublished documents signed by L. I. Brezhnev, are of great interest. With his personal example and fiery and convincing party words, L. I. Brezhnev inspired the Soviet troops to exploits. The collection includes six such documents. They describe the situation in the battles against the German-fascist aggressors, the unity between army and people and the courage and daring of the Soviet army soldiers.

With figures and specific facts the new documents show how, from the very first days of the war, the working people toiled selflessly in industry and agriculture. Most enterprises were converted to the production of military ordnance and equipment. The heroic toil of workers, peasants, scientists, engineers and technicians was subordinated to the needs of the front. "Through intensive work in industry, kolkhozes, mines and laboratories we shall bring the victory over the hated enemy closer," stated the appeal of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Ukrainian SSR Sovnarkom and the Communist Party of the Ukraine (Bolsheviks) Central Committee to the Ukrainian people, issued in the first days of the war (Vol 1, p 68).

The documents describing the work of the communist party, the Soviet government and the local party and Soviet organs on the relocation of the big enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences with its institutions, schools and cultural values, and the evacuation of the republic's population to the eastern parts of the country are of great interest. Never before had there been such a relocation of human masses and technology. L. I. Brezhnev, who rated this unique exploit highly, noted that "essentially, the entire industrial country was moved over thousands of kilometers. There, in uninhabited areas, frequently under the open skies, machines and machine tools were put to work literally the moment they were unloaded from the trains."

The documents show the aid which the fraternal peoples of the USSR gave in relocating industrial enterprises, kolkhozes, higher schools and cultural-educational institutions and in supplying work and housing to the evacuated population of the Soviet Ukraine.

The volume also includes documents on the bloody crimes committed on Ukrainian soil by the Hitlerite executioners together with nationalistic elements consisting of the local kulaks' belated followers and criminals. Thus, in a period of only a few days the occupation forces shot 70,000 civilians; in Khar'kov 25,000 Soviet people were killed in toxic gas trucks alone. During the occupation more than 30,000 were killed in Vinnitsa, 25,000 in Rovno and 170,000 in the territory of

the Donbass. All in all, during the occupation more than four million people were tortured and shot, including women, old people and children. Furthermore, the executioners took into slavery from the Ukraine more than two million people.

The communist party gave tremendous attention to the development of a partisan movement in the temporarily occupied Soviet territory. Following the example of the working people of Moscow and Leningrad, people's militia detachments and fighter battalions were raised.

In accordance with the instructions of the VKP(b) Central Committee, dated 18 July 1941, "On Organizing the Struggle Behind the German Forces," which embodied Lenin's ideas to the effect that "partisan combat actions must be carried out under party control" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 12, p 229), the Communist Party of the Ukraine (Bolsheviks) Central Committee and the republic's local party organs set up underground obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms and clandestine organizations and groups. More than 26,000 party members were assigned to them. The Komsomol underground was organized under the leadership of the party organs.

A large quantity of documents shows that the fire of a national war was becoming more violent over the occupied territory of the Soviet Ukraine with every passing day. We read with emotion material describing the courageous struggle of the Soviet guerrilla patriots. The courageous partisan formations headed by S. A. Kovpak, A. N. Saburov, A. F. Fedorov, M. I. Naumov and others will remain famous forever. The activities of partisan formations and clandestine organizations and groups in Donetskaya Oblast, the Chernigov area and other parts of Soviet Ukraine and the mass participation of the population in defeating the political, economic and military measures of the occupation forces were aspects of struggle against the aggressors which were inseparably interlinked and which supplemented and strengthened each other. The partisan movement was strong because of the comprehensive support of the entire population. Many new documents describe the struggle waged by clandestine youth organizations: the "Molodaya Gvardiya" clandestine Komsomol organization in the Krasnodon area and the Komsomol clandestine groups in Slavuta, Khmel'nitskaya Oblast, in Odesskaya Oblast and in Nikolayev, Poltava, Rovno, Kherson and Khotin.

In the course of their struggle against the occupation forces the Soviet people, who were ideologically welded together by the party, were inflexible in their principled class intolerance of fascism, the monstrous offspring of imperialism.

The second volume, which opens with a PRAVDA editorial entitled "There Will Be a Holiday on Our Streets Too!" deals with the period of the radical deflection in the course of the Great Patriotic War (19 November 1942-end of 1943). The 344 documents and materials it contains reflect the beginning of the mass expulsion of the fascist aggressors from Soviet soil, the liberation of the Left-Bank Ukraine, the battle for the Dnepr, the party's activities for the mobilization of the working people to give all-round aid to the advancing Soviet forces, the further development of the nationwide struggle on temporarily occupied territory, the labor exploit of workers, peasants and intellectuals in rebuilding the national economy destroyed by the enemy in the liberated areas, and the fraternal aid given by the peoples of the USSR for the restoration of the republic's economy and culture.

In describing the mass heroism of the Soviet troops in the battles for the liberation of Ukrainian territory from the German-fascist aggressors, the compilers of the work have introduced previously unpublished documents, such as decrees of military councils and combat and political reports of the command and the political organs of fronts and armies.

The volume includes exciting documents and materials which characterize the powerful offensive thrust and mass heroism displayed by the Soviet troops as representatives of the multinational family of peoples of the USSR during the battles for the liberation of settlements in Soviet Ukraine. The importance of this is enhanced by the fact that in the Ukraine the enemy had a powerful concentration of forces totaling 93 divisions, including 18 tank and motorized, i.e., about 40 percent of its forces and 72 percent of its tank divisions fighting on the Soviet-German front. This military force had to be defeated and the Soviet soil had to be cleared from the German-fascist occupation forces. Everything was subordinated to this task.

The collection has used documents from the archives and the periodical press which characterize the historically unparalleled exploit of the Soviet people. Dozens of thousands of soldiers, workers, kolkhoz members and intellectuals, members of the senior generation and young people displayed high military skills and infinite loyalty to the homeland. Thus, 2,438 troops of all arms were awarded the title Hero of the Soviet Union for heroism and courage displayed in the crossing of the Dnepr. They included members of 30 nationalities of our homeland.

Constructive work on the rebuilding of the republic's national economy and culture, destroyed by the occupation forces, and for the organization of life developed as the territory of Soviet Ukraine was being liberated. The documents show that despite the difficult wartime circumstances the VKP(b) Central Committee and the Soviet government paid great attention to this matter. Work was undertaken throughout the country for the return of Ukrainian leading cadres and specialists to the liberated areas. In January and February 1943 alone representatives of the VKP(b) Central Committee and of the Communist Party of the Ukraine (Bolsheviks) Central Committee selected about 5,000 people for work in the party and soviet organs in the Ukraine, with the active participation of the party organizations in the eastern areas of the USSR. The decrees issued by the Bashkirskaya, Chkalovskaya, Kemerovskaya, Omskaya, Karagandinskaya, Tul'skaya, Novosibirskaya, Chelyabinskaya, Yaroslavskaya, Sverdlovskaya, Kustanayskaya and Leningrad Oblast party committees of the VKP(b) and the Moscow and Leningrad city party committees on assisting the working people of the Ukrainian SSR in rebuilding their economy and culture show the great friendship which exists among the peoples of the Soviet Union--the gigantic force which helped the Ukrainian people to heal the terrible wounds of the war and raise from the ruins and ashes cities and villages within a short time.

The third volume contains 383 documents and items which reflect the events of the final period of the Great Patriotic War (January 1944-9 May 1945), related to the total liberation of Ukrainian territory from the Hitlerite aggressors by the Soviet troops and the end of military activities.

The documents cover the party's activities related to the rebuilding of party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and soviet and economic organs. By the time the republic's territory was fully liberated, 24 obkoms, 78 gorkoms and 825 raykoms had resumed their activities. As a result of the return of party members from the armed forces and the return of the evacuated population from the eastern parts of the country, as well as the enrollment of the new members, in 1945 the republic's party organization virtually doubled compared with 1944. It numbered 320,307 party members or 56.7 percent of its prewar membership.

The VKP(b) Central Committee and the Soviet government provided substantial material aid to the liberated areas. A total of 18.3 billion rubles were spent in the concluding period of the Great Patriotic War for the restoration of the national economy of the Ukrainian SSR. Extensive work was done to rebuild cities and workers' settlements, food, light, communal, construction and printing industry enterprises, medical, scientific and cultural institutions and schools. In 2 years of selfless work by the Soviet people 123 big and 506 average-sized and small mines were commissioned. Between 1943 and 1945 fourteen blast and 35 Martin furnaces, 95 machine-building plants and 80 chemical enterprises as well as 21,000 kilometers of railroad tracks were restored thanks to the efforts of the entire Soviet people. At the beginning of the spring of 1945 areas in grain crops in the republic reached 84 percent of the prewar level. Cultural life was rebuilt as well.

The successful restoration of the republic's national economy and culture in the war years was the result of the high level creative initiative and activeness of the toiling masses headed by the communist party and of the advantages of the socialist system, the unified planning system of economic management and the fraternal help which all the peoples of the USSR gave to the Ukrainian people.

The final part of the collection includes documents and materials which reflect the victorious ending of the Great Patriotic War and the completion of the reunification of the Ukrainian lands with the single Soviet state.

The new three-volume anthology of documents and materials, assembled by the Institute of Party History of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee, is a major contribution to the historiography of the Great Patriotic War. It was welcomed with a great deal of interest by historical researchers and a widespread readership. This is yet another documentary proof of the heroic exploit of the Soviet people, an exploit which will live through the centuries.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

LABOR EXPLOIT OF THE GRAIN GROWERS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 116-117

[Review by N. Plakhotnyy of the book "Kazakhstanskiy Milliard-80" [The Kazakhstan Billion-80]. Kazakhstan, Alma-Ata, 1981, 343 pages]

[Text] The publication of documentary works describing the historical accomplishments of our contemporaries, the builders of communism, has become a good publishing tradition. Frequently, the participants in real events become authors of books. This is the special, the durable value of each cited fact and printed line. Put together, it enables us to trace more profoundly the origins of the labor heroism of the Soviet people in all its manifestations.

This fully applies to the anthology "Kazakhstanskiy Milliard-80." It was written by a large number of people: rank and file virgin land grain growers of different generations, economic managers and specialists, scientists, statesmen, party workers, writers, journalists, in a word anyone who is directly or indirectly involved in the battle for the new Kazakhstan billion. Naturally, it is a question of our daily bread, for the struggle for it is one of the greatest accomplishments of mankind and the duty of the grain grower is the most honorable on earth.

The epic of the virgin lands, which took place in the steppes of Kazakhstan by the will of the party and under the direct management and with the most active participation of Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, who headed the republic's party organization at that time, became the base of today's accomplishments, the launching pad for the legitimate success achieved by the republic's farmers, as in previous years. We can say today with full justification that it was precisely the virgin lands that enabled the Kazakh SSR to become a powerful granary of the country, to achieve a powerful scientific-production potential and to become an area for the earth and space exploits of the Soviet people.

Every single loaf produced in Kazakhstan is special and has its labor biography. Last year preparations for the harvest were thorough and systematic. The entire country awaited its beginning with great interest: as we know, the harvest crowns the farmer's labor. In his Alma-Ata speech, delivered on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the republic and of its party organization, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev approved the high socialist pledges taken by the rural workers to pour no less than one billion poods of grain into the granary of the state and noted with satisfaction that to the people of Kazakhstan one billion has already become the norm.

The anthology contains a great deal of firsthand information. The reader is offered a broad panoramic view of the battle for grain at its various sectors. He looks at one or another event through the eyes of the participants such as A. Tatarenko, a mechanizer from Kustanay, A. Tkach, the leader of a tractor-crop growing brigade in Karaganda, P. Kolos, operator of an automotive combine in Tselinograd, N. Kotlyar, an agronomist from Kokchetav, N. Gnoyevyy, first secretary of the Uritskiy Rayon party committee, Kustanayskaya Oblast, and others. Also included among such people are the heroes of outer space Vareriy Ryumin and Leonid Popov. In the course of their many months of flight they closely watched from their height above the clouds the activities of the grain growers, from the sowing to the harvesting, transmitting valuable meteorological information to earth, and helped to determine yields over huge areas in grain and advised how (depending on the complexity of weather conditions) to use available equipment better and more effectively.

The conclusion of this work is logical: grain growing is a collective undertaking. It is due only to the skillful coordination of the actions of all subunits in the huge army of rural workers and of the auxiliary services assigned to it that such an important national economic action as the harvesting campaign can be successfully implemented. In the final accounting, the decisive features are a skillful organization, strict discipline and the moral readiness of each labor collective and individual worker to carry out their specific practical assignments. On this basis the authors have discussed extensively experience gained in organizational-party activities at different levels, ranging from the republic's party committee to the primary and shop party organizations where, in fact, the foundations of all our subsequent accomplishments are laid.

"The rayon party committees honorably passed the difficult test for the right to head the masses and to organize them for great accomplishments," states A. Protozanov, first secretary of the Vostochno-Kazakhstanskaya Oblast party committee. "The reputation of the party worker and, above all, of the rayon party committee secretary, a person with a restless soul and sober judgment, a big heart and a will of iron, who lives among the people and works for their happiness, has become even higher. The harvest raised to a new height the title of party member. It surrounded with glory many a name and brought honor to the guardsmen of the harvest..." (p 163).

The value of these warm statements is that they are voiced by a practical party worker and participant in the battle for large-scale grain production in Kazakhstan.

We read that more than 140,000 agitators and political informants and 5,000 lecturers and political speakers provided ideological support for the 1980 harvest. A total of 6,500 rural cultural houses and clubs, 700 agitation trains and about 4,000 agitation brigades did important work in providing cultural services to the mechanizers directly in the fields.

The good humor of the people means a great deal in everything. It boosts courage and contributes to the display of individual skills and efforts. This, precisely, is the tremendous uplifting force of the moral factor. It is not created by itself

in the least. It is not accidental but is developed through the joint efforts of the party and economic worker, as the book convincingly proves with the help of specific examples.

The collection was made available to readers on the eve of the 26th CPSU Congress, and it naturally discusses the development of the mass socialist competition among the republic's rural workers for a successful start in the first year of the 11th Five-Year Plan.

Addressing the 26th party congress, D. A. Kunayev, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee, said: "Well aware of its responsibility for the further increase in grain production and animal husbandry goods, the republic's party organization will do everything possible so that existing reserves, the skill of its outstanding cadres, and the entire force of the virgin land upturned be subordinated, as the Central Committee demands, to the interests of the total implementation of the food program formulated by the party. We shall absolutely achieve this."

The experience of the last grain harvest, described in this book, guarantees this.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

HISTORICAL PATH OF THE CPCZ

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 117-119

[Review by Prof G. Karpov, doctor of philosophical sciences, of the book "Ocherk Istorii Kommunisticheskoy Partii Chekoslovakii" [Outline of the History of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia]. Translated from the Czech. S. I. Kolesnikov translation general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 430 pages]

[Text] The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was founded in 1921. Its emergence on the political arena was the legitimate result of the development of the world's revolutionary process, a powerful impulse and booster of which was the Great October Revolution. Since then the party has traveled a difficult road of struggles and victories. Always in the center of the country's political life, and having earned the mass support of the working class, the CPCZ became the leading force of the Czechoslovak socialist society and a firm link in the world's socialist comity.

The experience gained in the organization and development of the CPCZ does not benefit the Czechoslovak communists alone. It is also of great importance to other parties and to the international communist movement as a whole. This makes the interest with which the Soviet public welcomed this book on the historical progress of the CPCZ, drafted by the institutes of Marxism-Leninism of the CPCZ and CPS central committees, understandable.

In raising the working people to the struggle against capitalist oppression, the revolutionary party of the Czechoslovak working class expressed the basic interests of the people. In the alarming prewar 1930s the communists were the heart of the nationwide movement against fascism and for the creation of a united front in the struggle for Czechoslovak national independence and autonomy. In the tragic days of the Munich treachery committed by the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie, the communist party was the only political force which gave the people a clear political guideline for the irreconcilable struggle against Hitlerite occupation. The party became the main force in the resistance movement during the period of fascist rule. The communists displayed daring, courage and heroism in the struggle against the occupation forces. Several CPCZ Central Committees were wiped out by the fascists, 25,000 Czechoslovak communists perished and dozens of thousands were subjected to cruel repressions in jails and death camps. "Their selfless struggle became a fiery appeal to the progressive forces of the Czech and Slovak peoples to carry the banner of communism to new victories" (p 238).

Under difficult clandestine conditions the CPCZ did everything possible to accelerate the defeat of the Hitlerites in World War II. The communists were the most active combat force in the partisan units and in the 1944 Slovak national uprising. They were also in the leading ranks of the fighters of the May 1945 uprising of the Czech people, at the final stage of the liberation mission of the Soviet Army in Czechoslovakia.

We read with interest the description of the first steps in the activities of the communist party following the liberation of Czechoslovakia, when problems of the nature of the social and governmental system of the country and of the leading role of the working class were being resolved. It was then that the CPCZ became a mass political party which numbered 712,000 members at the end of August 1945. However, the communist party was not the only political force within the National Front which had proclaimed its readiness to assume responsibility for the country's future. In the Czech region there were the social democratic, the national-socialist and the people's party; the so-called democratic party was in Slovakia.

"The communist party," the book notes, "realized that in the course of the revolution a process of class differentiation would be developing within the united National Front, and that contradictions between the interests of the working class and the bourgeoisie would legitimately aggravate the class struggle. It was necessary, therefore, to insure that the further development of the revolution would lead to the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship as a necessary prerequisite for the building of socialism in Czechoslovakia. The struggle for the growth of the national-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution became the main content of the class battles in the years that followed" (p 243).

In February 1948 the struggle waged by the CPCZ, headed by the outstanding revolutionary K. Gottwald, ended in favor of the working class and the entire toiling people. The socialist revolution won. "The main and decisive result of the February event was the fact that the power was totally assumed by the working class which exercised it allied with the small and middle peasantry and the toiling intelligentsia" (p 269).

In pursuing a course toward building socialism, the CPCZ guided the society within the framework of the National Front; the political parties and mass organizations which were part of the front adopted the communist party's platform and actively participated in the building of socialism.

The communist party proved to be on the level of the tasks set by history. Under its leadership the foundations of socialism were laid in the country in the realm of economics and the upsurge of production forces was insured. Industrial production increased and agriculture became more efficient thanks to the conversion of individual farmers to collective farming methods. Great successes were achieved by socialist culture. Friendship between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries strengthened and its international positions were consolidated.

This aspect of CPCZ activities would be incomplete and onesided were we to ignore the lessons of the crisis which developed within the party and Czechoslovak

society in 1968-1969. The readers will find in the book a thorough interpretation of the characteristics of the class struggle in the country and in the international arena at that time. It describes the way in which, under the conditions of more complex international relations and of the aggravation of the ideological struggle the anticommunist centers and imperialist special services tried to break up the unity of the global socialist system and separate individual socialist countries from the Soviet Union. In Czechoslovakia they were relying on opportunistic and revisionist elements which were encouraging the population's discontent with subjective errors and shortcomings and violations of the norms of party and social life.

Hiding behind demagogic statements regarding a "democratic model" of socialism or "socialism with a human face," the right-wing opportunistic and antisocialist forces captured one position after another in the party and the state and purposefully attacked the basic values and principles of the socialist system. This led the party and society into a state of severe crisis which could have developed into an open counterrevolutionary action and civil war.

The book states that, aware of their class, national and international responsibility for the fate of socialism in Czechoslovakia, thousands of party members, individual citizens and entire collectives of working people and representatives of different population strata and organizations, members of the CPCZ Central Committee and the Czechoslovak government and National Assembly deputies, having failed to take measures against the growing danger, turned to the leadership of the fraternal parties and the governments of the members of the socialist comity with the request to give the Czechoslovak people international assistance in the defense of socialism. As we know, this assistance was given. This was a necessary act of international solidarity which was consistent both with the general class interests of the Czechoslovak working people and with those of the international working class, the socialist comity and the world communist and national-liberation movements.

After the August 1968 events the revisionist elements in the party's leadership, having changed their tactic, undertook to create in the country a constant string of crisis situations. The decisive confrontation between Marxist-Leninist and right-wing forces took place at the CPCZ Central Committee Plenum (April 1969) at which Gustav Husak was elected CPCZ Central Committee first secretary. The necessary prerequisites were created for mounting a decisive offensive on right-wing opportunist and antisocialist forces. The book offers an extensive description of the process of consolidation which took part within the party and the society, the building of developed socialism in Czechoslovakia and the formulation and implementation of the decisions of the 14th and 15th CPCZ congresses. Honorably surmounting major difficulties and trials, the CPCZ bears high the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

In conclusion, taking the history of the CPCZ as an example, the authors interpret the view of scientific communism to the effect that the working class can carry out its historical mission and overthrow capitalism only under the leadership of a combat revolutionary party, all of whose activities are based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The history of the CPCZ proves, the authors further note, that the prestige and all-round implementation of the leading role of the communist party in socialist

society are based on strict observance of the Leninist principles and norms of party life. The party must firmly reject all carriers of hostile ideological influences and engage in a decisive struggle against any of their manifestations.

Close ties with the working class and the broad popular masses in the country were developed by the CPCZ in the course of long years of dedicated struggle. The strengthening of the leading role of the working class, which is closely allied with the cooperated peasantry and the intelligentsia, the book notes, is a decisive prerequisite for the further development of the socialist society. The all-round development of the nations and nationalities in the republic, based on equality and further strengthening of the common binding principles of socialism, are major prerequisites for the strengthening of the moral and political unity of the Czechoslovak working people (see p 424).

The CPCZ is an active component of the international communist movement. It is "dedicating all its efforts so that the building of socialism in Czechoslovakia can contribute to a maximum extent to the strengthening of the world socialist system and the struggle waged by all revolutionary forces for peace, democracy and social progress" (p 425).

As it welcomes its great anniversary, the CPCZ is confidently leading the people of Czechoslovakia to the building of a mature socialist society, resolving in a socialist way the basic problems of the country's social and economic development.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

CREATIVE APPROACH TO TOPICAL PROBLEMS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 119-124

[Review by Ye. Ambartsumov of the book "Vastaus on Vasemmistopolitiikka" [The Alternative is Leftist Policy] by Taisto Sinisalo. Oy Kursiivi, Helsinki, 1981, 163 pages]

[Text] Early this year a book by Taisto Sinisalo, deputy chairman of the Communist Party of Finland, entitled "The Alternative is Leftist Policy" was published in Helsinki. This book deserves the attention of our readers not only because they are invariably interested in any fraternal communist party but because it goes far beyond the title and beyond strictly Finnish problems. The point is that the forms and directions of the class struggle which have developed in today's Finland indicate to a large extent the path it will take in other developed capitalist countries. Judging by the facts leading to the publication of this book, it represents more than the work of an individual author. It developed out of lengthy and regular discussions among Finnish Marxists, and an entire series of works published as a result confirms the fruitfulness of such comradely debates. The daring and profound Marxist view of the contemporary world, in the complexity of its problems, makes this book one of those which join the channel of the overall creative concept of the communist movement, drafted through the collective efforts of the fraternal parties and codified in the documents of the Berlin Conference of European Communists and other important international meetings. It is also the credo of the contemporary party member, and a simple and clear story of how he looks at his own party, proving to the reader that communism is the only true way.

From the very first page the author addresses himself to the main problem of our time: that of the preservation of peace which, in the case of Finland as well, is of great concern. He frankly discusses the military threat which has increased due to imperialism. However, he does not surrender to pessimism as have many non-communist observers, some of whom sincerely worry about this danger, but relies on mankind itself which is entirely able to consolidate the peace. The author recalls the results of the Stockholm appeal, the struggle against the neutron bomb and other initiatives. "At present the main social problem facing every person on earth is the termination of the arms race and the beginning of disarmament.... All peace-loving people and organizations should now energize their joint activities in favor of peace. Let possible differences of opinion not serve as an obstacle to the broadest possible cooperation on this most important problem of our time" (p 13). This is an approach of true communists apart from sectarianism. They openly and decisively point out the grave problem, call for the practical activities of the broad masses and extend their hand to all possible allies.

It is in the same key that T. Sinisalo discusses other global problems of mankind instead of avoiding them with the excuse that they have been raised by noncommunist movements or that superficially they do not affect Finland, as, for example, the relative worsening of the situation of the developing world. The author proves that the positive and democratic solution of these problems is in the interest of all mankind, including the Finnish people. All prerequisites to solve this exist: the growing awareness of such problems by the masses and the constructive example of socialism, which releases man's capabilities from the "straight jacket of capitalism." It is capitalism alone that prevents their solution because of its antihumanistic and antisocial nature which in fact intensifies them. That is why the "Finnish conclusions" expressed at the end of this section in the book may be reduced to the urgent need to struggle for democratic development.

In discussing prospects of the final two decades of our century, the author neither simplifies nor builds illusions. "Naturally," he say, "imperialism will use all of its opportunities and will not stop at anything in an effort to preserve its privileges. It will jump from one crisis to another and, along with other methods, will use militarism, the arms race and a policy of force. However...the ratio of social forces on earth has already experienced irreversible change in favor of the forces of peace and progress." The point is, the author explains, that "the changed ratio of forces is based on real socialism. The development of the socialist countries will take place on a stable basis, steadfastly, although not without contradictions. The forthcoming decades, during which the advantages of socialism will begin to display their full influence, will prove to even the greatest skeptics the historical superiority of socialism" (p 21).

Against this background, how should we assess the results and prospects in the development of contemporary Finland? The main content of the book answers this question.

We know that during the past decades major positive changes have taken place in that country: through adamant struggle the working people broadened their rights and enhanced their living standard; unity within the trade union movement was achieved; the communist party came out of its isolation and for a number of years has been a member of the government; friendly relations with the Soviet Union, relations which became a reliable base for Finland's foreign policy, were strengthened. The author takes all of this as a given, noting that "the ratio between the basic forces in society has changed. The working class and the other working people can no longer be ignored" (p 56).

However, T. Sinisalo goes deeper and focuses his attention on the negative characteristics, such as public discontent which, judging by sociological research, has become more widespread in Finland than in most Western European countries, and such as the feeling of social helplessness which, in his words, is spreading increasingly among the ordinary Finns. Examples of social regress "are the curtailment of housing construction, the emasculation of the general school reform, the crisis in the implementation of the public health care law, the impoverishment of families with children, considerable depreciation of the unemployment insurance system, erosion of pension reform, and preparations for the

taxation of social benefits. Unfortunately, such a list could be extended further" (p 57). Whereas in 1980 the real wage of the Finnish working people remained on the 1975 level, income from ownership and other entrepreneurial earnings had tripled. In light of these facts one may conclude: "The positions of capitalism have been clearly strengthened at the expense of the working people.... The national income is being distributed ever more unfairly" (pp 58-59).

In analyzing the domestic political situation, T. Sinisalo acknowledges the importance of the political freedoms gained by the working people. In his words, these freedoms are a weapon in their struggle. However, as a Marxist, the author proceeds properly from the fact that "The basis for defining the level of a democracy is the extent of actual political influence exerted by the people's masses. Therefore, the question lies not only in formal political freedoms but in actual participation in decision making...." (p 59). However, the author notes, on this level democracy in Finland has been "reduced. The involvement of the people in management is, naturally, possible. However, it is channeled in such a way that in terms of essential decisions it becomes minimal. This is the exact reason for the so-called disappointment of people in politics, which is currently under discussion" (p 60).

In the foreign policy area the author justifiably criticizes cases of pandering to right-wing, anti-Soviet and antisocialist elements, and the narrow interpretation by some circles of the 1948 Soviet-Finnish friendship, cooperation and mutual aid treaty.

The author consider as regressive also the totalitarian aspirations of the bourgeois state, manifested in arbitrary police actions and the passing of all kinds of emergency laws (a trend which, as we all know, is even more typical in large capitalist countries, starting with the United States), the reviving of right-wing fascist-type organizations (consider again the example of the United States and the FRG) and the intensification of fanatic-religious and nationalistic movements and sects (which is happening throughout the capitalist world).

"Naturally, we should not exaggerate the formal violations of bourgeois democracy," the author stipulates. "In many respects Finland is a relatively free country" (p 60). However, he adds, democracy is violated not only through manifestations of violence and open violation of democratic rights but within the framework of bourgeois democracy itself, in what is known as "soft" integration. This brings to mind the sharply critical concept of bourgeois democracy as "repressive tolerance," formulated by the now deceased Herbert Marcuse.

As in other bourgeois countries, the real power in Finland belongs to the bourgeoisie and to monopoly capital. The author demonstrates this by tracing two related processes: the reduced functions of parliament and the government, in which workers' parties are represented, and the growing role in the state of representatives of leading companies and, particularly, of monopoly staffs, such as organizations of entrepreneurs who either directly or through their experts influence not only the state but the organizations of working people. In this connection the study of the monopoly on knowledge, which T. Sinisalo accurately assesses as an important element of the bourgeois system, is topical.

Another of its contemporary elements is the use of the mass information media, with the help of which public opinion is channeled into directions useful to the bourgeoisie.

The third new quality of the bourgeois system is its impersonal nature, making it easier to depict its own interests as the common good which should not be opposed. "Thus, if technical employees are striking, the social and state apparatus of the bourgeoisie does everything possible to show how a single group can threaten the common good. This method is used according to the circumstances and the specific problem. This mechanism operates with amazing impeccability" (p 33). That is why, the author points out, "the normal form of bourgeois rule is based on the acceptance of its existence on the part of the majority of the population, although in reality it is decisively consistent with the interests of an insignificant minority" (p 28).

The author compares contemporary bourgeois society with an offspring of modernistic theater such as a happening, whose directors surprise the audience by involving it in the performance itself. In the same manner, the author ironically points out, "frequently the labor movement discovers that it is playing a role entirely different from the one it meant to play" (p 29).

This is a profound and clear description of the bourgeois system in Finland based, as we may note, on the analysis made by K. Marx, followed by A. Gramsci of the bourgeois "civilian society" and the famous "social contract," in which the author makes creative use of the critical analyses provided by contemporary Marxist researchers (from France, the FRG, Spain and other countries) of the power mechanism of state-monopoly capitalism. On this level, although based on Finnish material, T. Sinisalo's study becomes topical from the international viewpoint as well.

Following the same line, the "integration" of the class antagonist is converted into the party-political mechanism of the bourgeois state. Starting with the 1960s, the Finnish state took over the financing of all political parties represented in parliament. The official reason given was to give an equal opportunity to people's "less prosperous" parties in their competition against the bourgeois parties supported by capitalism. The author analyzes this new feature dialectically. While noting its positive aspects, particularly the fact that the strengthened positions of the parties within the governmental structure "destroys the omnipotence of the traditional age-old right-wing bureaucratic apparatus" (p 37), he also points out that this has "strengthened the positions of professional workers within the party apparatus and has made them basically independent of the activities and desires of the membership masses. Therefore, the opportunity was created to exert greater influence from the top downward rather than in the opposite direction, as was formerly the case. This undermines democracy and bureaucratizes party activities, as well as weakening the forces of the party as a whole, for no governmental subsidies could compensate for membership activities. Furthermore, it means that the influence of the party membership on governmental affairs is reduced while, correspondingly, the force of the state's influence on membership masses rises. It is not impossible for the leading party organs to tend to identify themselves with the stability of the state policy and to accept it as

their own. This would give validity to the claim that the parties have become a tool of the state in its attitude toward the citizens, whereas in the past they were the tool of the citizens (and even of the people) in their dealings with the state" (p 36).

Such changes affect the trade unions as well. For many years Finland has followed the so-called "income policy" in which the state and entrepreneurial organizations, together with the leadership of the Central Trade Unions Association, determine for a certain period of time (usually one or two years) mutually acceptable norms of price increases, entrepreneurial income and wages. "In this situation the trade union machinery is always in danger of converting from a weapon in the struggle of the working people into an instrument for insuring the obedience of the working people. Instead of protecting the interests of the working people it becomes concerned with the preservation of labor peace at a cost which does not exceed the framework of state-monopoly control. Gradually, all trade union activities, ways of organization and thinking begin to adapt to the system. Internal democracy is curtailed while bureaucracy expands. In this case the curtailment of democracy does not always mean its open violation, although many such cases could be cited. It may simply become a case of reducing the activeness of the membership masses. Quietly, the tremendous power of the trade unions turns to support of the existing system" (p 37).

We know that state financing of political parties, the "income policy" and other forms of symbiosis between the bourgeois state and its antagonists have become the rule in the United States, Great Britain, Italy, the FRG, Sweden and other developed capitalist countries, arousing the concern of many noted leaders of the leftist and communist movements. That is what makes so timely the analysis by T. Sinisalo and his warning of the danger this may entail. "In the final account, however, it is a question simply of the extension of state control over increasingly broader social strata and over its ever more profound invasion of human life" (p 35). "This, precisely," specifies the author, "is the nature of this characteristic contradiction which must always be remembered by the labor movement.... The political struggle, although waged in the defense of the interests of the oppressed strata, could become entirely acceptable to the ruling system. It can even become an inseparable link of this system, unless in the course of the daily struggle we question the system itself and unless we keep exposing the main interrelationships within the power structure of this system" (p 26).

Seventy years ago, in a most interesting study of the social structure of power and the mechanism of its exercise in what was then Russia, V. I. Lenin pointed out that these problems "in terms of their importance are among the leading if not the first in the system of views of a Marxist who would like to find his way in surrounding reality" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." (Complete Collected Works), Vol 20, p 186). Since then, however, regrettably few Marxist studies on this topic have been published. T. Sinisalo's work substantially contributes to filling this gap.

The initiative in involving the workers parties and working people's organizations in the administration of the state was taken by the business and financial circles of Finland. Of late they have described it as "social contract." This was begun in the mid-1960s. "This was a new development in international practice. Actually, it

was a rather daring policy" (p 47). According to T. Sinisalo, the ruling Finnish bourgeoisie undertook a unique experiment by offering its "class brothers" in the rest of the capitalist world a new version of the political game.

In order to take the initiative away from the bourgeoisie, T. Sinisalo calls upon the left-wing forces to analyze, to interpret, to "sharpen" their policy toward a true nonconformist leftism. With equal firmness the author opposes "positive" integration within the capitalist system and "negative" integration, which represents a sectarian retreat within one's own shell and turning one's back to real problems and real politics. Conversely, in his view the main objective is to strengthen the workers, the communist movement in Finland, and to lead it and the entire country forward.

T. Sinisalo's arguments cannot fail to trigger the interest of the other national detachments of the international communist movement. The "social contract" is, judging by previous experiences in other countries, nothing but a defense of class cooperation, which is intrinsically opposed by the revolutionary communist movement. For under capitalism, it is always the bourgeoisie which ultimately benefits from such cooperation while it is the working class and the cause of democracy and socialism who lose.

T. Sinisalo's orientation toward strengthening leftist forces, the workers and communist movements above all, is not a verbal hope but the result of a substantiated study and consideration of its possibilities. The author points out its broadened objective social foundations, not, it is true, converted yet into a realized and active stand, as the absolute and relative numerical growth of hired labor, the working class in particular, and its augmentation with part of the intelligentsia and the white collar workers, and emphasizes that "The workers movement must be able to pay attention to the new working class strata not only because they may be short of experience and awareness but also because they represent its most dynamic part, its future" (p 75); in this case we must take into consideration "the new forms and requirements of the struggle and of the presumed renovations within the working class.... Therefore, the significance of the working class as a revolutionary class, which represents the nucleus of the democratic front, will be increasing rather than declining." The other reserves of the communist movement in Finland are the working peasants who, as T. Sinisalo points out, have not lost their importance in the least; students and young people in general; the women's movement; and progressive men of culture and science who "are particularly important to the working class" (p 79), for, pursuing as a unit a democratic direction, they could put their knowledge in the service of the struggling proletariat. "This is a necessary aspect in the process of raising the working class to the level of the leading class in the nation" (p 80).

The author particularly emphasizes the need for an alliance of the working class and its party with the so-called new movements, whether economic, feminist, neopopulist, or other which, as they face urgently new problems, sometimes even more sharply than the labor movement, and as they seek a new way of life as an alternative to capitalism, spontaneously gravitate toward socialism. All of this confirms the aggravation of the contradictions between the monopolies and the people and the possibility of creating the broadest possible antimonopoly front.

As we see, in this area as well T. Sinisalo's thoughts and considerations are not of interest to Finland alone.

According to the author a true leftist policy is the alternative to the strengthening of monopoly power, whether in its hard or "soft" aspect. It is a question of waging a struggle for radical democratic changes, which assumes exceeding the framework of the present political line of class cooperation. Anticipating the objection that such objectives may be "unrealistic," the author stipulates that he does not call in the least for "making Finland socialist next week." However, "the noting of realities does not mean their justification or their praise" (p 100). T. Sinisalo emphasizes that new realities and a new political realism must be developed.

The point is, the author explains, that "neither best results in the daily struggle nor major changes can be achieved within the framework of the dominating "realism." If the struggle of the workers' movement is based in advance on the fact that, in the final account, there will be a compromise with the bourgeoisie, and if from the very beginning the struggle is abandoned for the sake of having "the least of two evils," it is possible that not even this will be obtained, if not on this occasion then on the next.... Finding oneself at the mercy of the bourgeois system may be the eventual outcome." The solution to such a "negative spin," logically concludes T. Sinisalo, "is precisely calling the masses to the struggle for the development of new realities and of a new ratio of forces" (p 101).

The essence of these new realities is that they must coordinate the strategic with the daily objectives of the workers' and the communist movements. In order to accomplish this, the leftist forces must offer an alternative suggestion to any problem, such as to satisfy daily requirements to a maximum extent but also to lead the movement along its strategic direction, violating the "game rules" imposed by the bourgeoisie and weakening the structure and the core of bourgeois power. For "it is not minimum requirements as such that bring the people together but activities aimed at the solution of essential problems" (Ibid.). Briefly stated, the truly leftist policy supported by the author has a clearly marked socialist orientation.

T. Sinisalo formulates interesting specific suggestions for such a leftist program: forbidding dismissal without the agreement of the trade union organization, which could lay the foundations for involving the workers in the management of enterprises and the economy as a whole; the creation of a comprehensive social security system; and the development of forms of direct local democracy, which would help to undermine the bourgeois bureaucratic machinery and, in the expression of the author, to create "centers of real power of the working people." In the field of foreign policy the author calls for "acting jointly with the Soviet Union in strengthening international peace and security," and "undertaking active efforts for the democratization of international economic relations and for resolving Third World problems" (let us add that after the book was already published T. Sinisalo expressed the valuable suggestion that Finland start the initiative of banning the neutron weapon). He also refers to the decisions passed at the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of Finland, which formulated a number of most important programmatic requirements of the Finnish communists.

However, the author's purpose is not in the least that of broadening the range of such demands but of stimulating a broad discussion involving all democratic forces. This would help to bring up the most important problems and free the initiative of the masses which alone must define their program. "Leftist policy means a policy pursued not only in the interest of the people but also a policy pursued together with the people, the policy of the people themselves," he notes. "...Orientation toward the masses is also an answer to the feeling of alienation which the people are experiencing from the policy of the leadership and the new elite which is developing within it" (pp 104-105). Only this could defeat the "social contract" and other forms of this notorious sociopolitical "integration." That is why the democratization of all social areas, ranging from the state apparatus to the mass information media and from the economy to culture, is the linchpin of the leftist policy suggested by the author.

The author explains that the concept of a truly leftist policy must be considered not within a strictly party framework but as addressed to the entire people of Finland, for in the case of approaching some problems party-political division, he notes, may even prevent their optimum solution. Such would be the case, for example, in the election of municipal leaderships or managements of various local democratic associations.

This does not mean in the least that the author belittles the leading role of the communist party. "The possibility of autonomous activity on the part of the masses increases. At the same time, however, the management of such activity gains in importance. It is this that makes the party not only 'still necessary' but even more topical" (p 145). This thought is the essence of the concluding part of the book.

This part represents the proud statement of a communist about his party, its advantages compared with all other parties, and its special features, such as revolutionism, the scientific nature, true democracy, constant and live interaction with the toiling masses and proletarian internationalism, which can only help it to develop more profoundly its truly national character. According to the author political morality, which opposes the "immoral nature of bourgeois politics--the radical contradiction between words and actions--" is an important link in party activities. This emotionally and aphoristically written chapter offers a brilliant and convincing description of the communist party regardless of audience or country. At the same time, as he discusses topical problems and the party's political line, true to the theme of his book, the author calls upon the party to expand its activities among the masses and to enhance the activeness of its rank and file members and primary organizations.

T. Sinisalo pays particular attention to the party's internal life and to the problem of the full restoration of its unity. Whatever attitude one may have toward the author's political views, it is obvious that the book will provide no grounds for doubting his profound interest in strengthening unity within the Communist Party of Finland and eliminating the threat of a split. "...The Communist Party of Finland," he emphasizes, "needs everyone of its members. It needs all its forces. Not one of us is unnecessary, even when all of us act together."

The author is also right when he adds that "The Communist Party of Finland can become united only if unanimity, which does not exclude frank discussions or a variety of views, and unity in practical actions within the party are strengthened and broadened on a common Marxist-Leninist basis" (p 156).

This addition is particularly important in connection with attacks mounted against already existing, real socialism, organized by bourgeois propaganda and which, the author frankly states, has some reverberations in the labor movement; let us add that this is not the case of Finland alone. Nevertheless, we cannot accuse the author of engaging in the thoughtless defense of anyone's experience. For example, he justifiably writes that "The Soviet Union as such is no one's model. The revolution in Russia and the development of the Soviet Union embody the entire tremendous variety of national characteristics. At the same time, however, they also reveal general laws which must be clarified with the help of a theoretical study and which may be used by other countries in accordance with their own circumstances" (p 159).

This accurate view is in harmony with similar statements made by noted leaders of the international communist movement in many countries such as, for example, L. Longo who, discussing the October Revolution and the Soviet way to socialism, pointed out that this is not a model but a permanent guideline.

As a person who rejects sectarianism, communist T. Sinisalo does not separate his party from the other progressive forces. This is mentioned at the beginning of the book and the same thesis constitutes the basis of the author's idea concerning the creation of a government of democratic cooperation, in which all democratic parties, including naturally the communist party, would not simply work side by side but which would go further in the implementation of the principle of "increasing the direct influence of the people on the country's life."

In the course of a party discussion related to its forthcoming 19th congress, discussing the question of party unity, A. Saarinen, chairman of the Communist Party of Finland, pointed out its universally accepted methodological foundation: creative Marxism-Leninism. The reader will be convinced that T. Sinisalo's book is an excellent example of this. The work may be considered a contribution to the common international cause--the theory and politics of the world communist movement.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

SCHOOL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE 'HAPPY' PERCENTAGE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 125-126

[Letter to the editor by M. Tetel'baum, Russian language and literature teacher, Bol'shoy Monok Village, Beyskiy Rayon, Krasnoyarskiy Kray]

[Text] It would be difficult to overestimate the contribution our secondary general educational school must make to the implementation of the great program for economic and social development approved by the 26th party congress.

The task of the school, the delegates to the congress said, is steadily to improve the training process and actively to develop in the growing generation a feeling of social duty and a communist outlook. The CC CPSU accountability report considers completing the transition to mandatory universal secondary education the reaching of an important milestone. "The main thing today," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "is to raise the quality of training and of labor and moral education in the schools, to eliminate formalism in assessing the results of the work of teachers and students, to strengthen ties between training and life and to improve the preparedness of school students for socially useful labor."

Every year more than one million secondary school graduates join the army of builders of communism. The congressional program for economic and social development gives a great meaning to the life of every teacher and every secondary school student.

The party congress described the role of the teacher in the implementation of the tasks currently facing the school as decisive, for successful work depends precisely on his direct pedagogical activities in the classroom and his daily contacts with his students. However, this role also increases the authoritativeness of his views on ways of improving school training. It is no accident that the central press organs offer extensive space to rank and file school workers. However, the extent to which the leadership of the educational system listens to their views is a different matter.... Let us address ourselves to a topic which has been frequently discussed by our press over the past decade but which has still not received the official answer of the USSR Ministry of Education.

In the face of the new historical accomplishments the evil of "percentage mania" in schools which has long and severely been condemned by Soviet society becomes entirely intolerable. Frequently the real solution of most complex problems of school life is replaced with a pursuit of "happy" high-grade percentages. The moral principles of educational work and the very quality of education are

sacrificed to this illusory "measure" of school effectiveness. However, for the sake of pleasing the accountability system, school managers and teachers find themselves facing the difficult choice of either cheating for the sake of a "happy" percentage or doing their work conscientiously but, by this token, finding themselves in the unenviable position of people who do not meet official requirements.

Whereas at the introduction of secondary universal education into the country the aspiration of some managers to adopt the easiest control and management method was understandable, today the higher requirements apply precisely to the quality of education and training and the harm of the percentage criterion becomes entirely obvious. No special studies or deep discussions are needed to prove this. It is sufficient to look at any school to see what is taking place.

However, the following objection may be voiced: "What would you substitute as a criterion if you reject the percentage method?"

Let us answer simply: it would be the true qualities of our graduates, which could be determined only by reality. The extent to which the requirements and demands of reality are met can be determined by the feedback of industry, the higher schools and the armed forces.

How does our life itself test the civic-mindedness and humaneness of secondary school graduates? What is the level of development and education of this golden fund which it delivers to the labor reserves system, this main forge of cadres of the leading class of the country? Through what specific school accomplishments are the industriousness and Soviet patriotism and internationalism of the school students revealed? How do the best teachers succeed through their creative work and love for the children to inspire them to work and to study the arts, physical culture or anything else which will turn them into all-round developed harmonious communist-oriented people? It is the answers to these questions which enable us to judge of the work of the school.

The way in which this feedback must be carried out and the type of social control which must be applied are different matters worthy of special consideration. What is clear, however, is that as long as the school educational system is accountable only to itself and grades itself as "100 percent" successful it will not be answerable to the social areas for which it is producing its "goods," and it would be difficult to expect any decisive improvement in school matters.

In my view, it would be expedient to undertake the decisive improvement of the system of periodical school inspections with the help of the public and, once and for all, to organize the state inspection of schools.

The most important problem is that of the moral purity of the atmosphere which is daily absorbed by both teachers and students.

In the last article he wrote V. I. Lenin defined the most valuable qualities which characterize truly well educated people of whom one could guarantee that they will never accept a word on faith, will never say a word going against their

conscience, will not be afraid to acknowledge any kind of difficulty or to engage in any struggle for the sake of meeting their seriously set objectives ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 45, p 391).

Anything which conflicts with this Leninist behest must be decisively uprooted from school practices. The public education organs have the responsibility of listening to the voice of the teachers and of noticing and pulling out any thistles which may grow on the field of education.

In no other area in human life is the time between planting and harvesting so long as in education. This makes it even more difficult to correct any faults in the main output in "spiritual production"--man, the subject of historical creativity and the builder of the new society.

Therefore, the time has come to take immediate measures to put an end to the faulty practice of "We want to put fail but instead we put pass" (as the principal of a rural school wrote in a newspaper as long as 13 years ago). The student must be given a grade consistent with his honest toil, which objectively characterizes the level of his knowledge, including entering the failing mark in his report card.

In my view, the elimination from school practice of great percentages as a means for assessing the quality of school work is an urgent measure in terms of today's improvements in the education and upbringing of our country's young generation.

5003
CSO: 1802/14

IN THE AFTERMATH OF KOMMUNIST PUBLICATIONS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 81 pp 126-128

[Text] "Work Without Laggards, With an Intensive Plan!"

Such was the title of a letter by Hero of Socialist Labor G. I. Sonin, chairman of the Rossiya Kolkhoz, Kozel'skiy Rayon, Kaluzhskaya Oblast, which was published in KOMMUNIST No 8, 1979. The author discussed the valuable initiative of the farm's collective, sponsoring two lagging kolkhozes so that they might take their place among the frontrankers. This initiative, as the journal reported (No 10, 1979) was actively supported by all rural workers in Kozel'skiy Rayon. It was approved by the All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes which passed a special decree in connection with the letter in KOMMUNIST and decided to make the initiative wide-spread.

A certain amount of time has passed since then and we can now see the specific effect of this patriotic initiative on the farming practices of other oblast and autonomous republics in the Nonchernozem, V. N. Pustozerov, deputy chairman of the All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes, reported.

He states in his letter that in discussing the materials published in KOMMUNIST and the decree of the All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes, many farms and their party organizations drafted recommendations on how to assist most effectively economically weak kolkhozes to improve their production organization, apply progressive technology, upgrade yields and capital productivity and make effective use of material and technical resources. Currently, these recommendations are being implemented.

In Khislavichskiy Rayon, Smolenskaya Oblast, the Druzhba Kolkhoz became the sponsor of the lagging "Borets" Farm; the aid it provided in the organization of animal husbandry made it possible for the Borets Farm to increase milk and meat production by 12 percent, milk sales by 11 percent and meat by 31 percent. The farm's gross income rose by 12 percent.

The mechanizers of Zarya Kommunizma Kolkhoz, Korenevskiy Rayon, Kurskaya Oblast, assisted the economically weak Zarya, Bol'shevik, imeni Kalinin and imeni Tel'man kolkhozes to master the production of sugar beets on an industrial basis; as a result, last year the farms raised a good beet crop and fulfilled their plans for its sale to the state. It is the custom of the oblast to recommend specialists of leading farms for the position of kolkhoz chairmen of lagging farms.

In the Tatar ASSR 50 frontranking kolkhozes became sponsors of 68 economically poor ones. The initial result of this aid in Aktanyshskiy Rayon in the republic, in particular, was that all lagging farms completed the last farm year in far better condition than in previous years. They were able to fulfill their national economic plans for the sale of all types of animal husbandry goods to the state.

Useful work in organizing sponsorship of lagging farms is being done in Chuvashiya. The Kolkhoz imeni Michurin, Urmarskiy Rayon, is helping the Chuvashiya and Musirmanskiy Sovkhozes to organize their work better and make more effective use of the equipment and the land. In Batyrevskiy Rayon, in the same republic, the Leninets Kolkhoz assumed sponsorship over the Alga Farm. It is helping it to apply progressive potato growing technology and is training the mechanizers to handle the machinery.

The letter of the All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes Presidium cites many similar examples. The letter also points out, however, that last year it was only the beginning of the dissemination of the initiatives of the Rossiya Kolkhoz. The presidium is continuing its work, focusing the attention of the practical workers on the fact that sponsorship of lagging farms must not be reduced to charity. The main efforts must be focused on the fuller utilization of internal reserves and the application of progressive experience and technology in kolkhoz production, so that the tasks which the 26th CPSU Congress set the kolkhozes may be resolved more successfully.

"Big and Accessible Energy Reserve," by S. Kashirov, USSR deputy minister of gas industry

The Ministry of Gas Industry considered the article "Big and Accessible Reserve of Energy" by P. Levitin (KOMMUNIST, No 17, 1980) and deems the formulation of the matter of the need for more extensive utilization of turboexpanders in the utilization of the energy released by natural gas pressure entirely correct.

The Ministry of Gas Industry is doing specific work in this direction. The ministry has set up the Soyuz Turbogas All-Union Scientific-Production Association, one of whose main tasks is the development and application of turboextenders. So far this sector has focused its main attention on the use of turboextenders as part of the system for the preparation and cooling of gas at the fields which yield the highest-stratum energy. In 1976 the compressor plant in Kazan' of the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building manufactured an experimental series of TKO-25/64 turboextenders. The machines were installed in the gas fields in the Ukraine. However, because of many structural shortcomings the turboextenders did not find extensive industrial use and their production was stopped.

The Soyuz Turbogas Association developed a more advanced block automated turboextender, the BTDA-5/100, with a productivity of five million cubic meters per day. The association has already manufactured 22 such units which are being installed and undergoing field tests at the natural gas deposits of Central Asia, the Komi ASSR, Tyumenskaya Oblast and the Ukraine.

The use of turboextenders along the fuel gas lines which supply energy to the compressor stations is promising. It becomes possible to use not only the energy

of the pressure but the heat of the released gases from the turbines by warming up the gas before it enters the turboextender. The ministry is planning to manufacture turboextenders for this technological system in 1981-1984.

The problem of the use of turboextenders at natural gas distribution stations is more complex. It involves considerable fluctuation in the pressure and gas outlays in seasonal, weekly and daily cycles and the fact that these stations themselves do not need electric power. The 1981 plan of the Soyuz Turbogas Scientific-Production Association calls for the drafting of a technical-economic report on the expediency of the utilization of turboextenders at Ukrainian SSR natural gas distribution stations. A decision will be made regarding the further development of the work in this direction on the basis of the report.

"Study of the Past in Close Relation to the Present"

Under this title KOMMUNIST (No 18, 1980) published a review of the journal NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA. The article in KOMMUNIST was discussed at an expanded plenum of the party bureau and management of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of General History. A report on the work of the editors for the period between the 25th and 26th CPSU congresses was submitted by S. L. Tikhvinskiy, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, editor in chief of NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA.

According to Z. V. Udal'tsova, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of General History, and Doctor of Historical Sciences V. L. Malkov, party bureau secretary, the session dealt with the exceptional importance of the survey which "directs us to the further intensified development and interpretation of topical problems of general history," and with the positive assessments of the journal's materials. At the same time, the criticism of shortcomings in its work was acknowledged. It was also pointed out that the KOMMUNIST article "draws our attention to the need to increase the coordinating and organizing role of the journal and to improve its methods for providing scientific information."

In the resolution which was passed, the letter notes, the party bureau approved the work done by the editors of the journal, who are party members, on the implementation of tasks set by the 25th CPSU Congress and of the party's decrees on ideological matters. It called for focusing attention on the elaboration of scientific problems in the light of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress. The party bureau also recommended that the journal's party organization study and take into consideration the critical remarks and wishes contained in the survey. The party bureau decision outlines specific measures for improving the planning of scientific research and strengthening creative cooperation between the broad scientific public and the institute's printed organs.

The problems raised in the survey were also discussed at a meeting of the editors of NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA and at a party-trade union meeting of the editorial personnel. "The editorial collegium and the editors of NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA report in their letter S. L. Tikhvinskiy, the journal's editor in chief, and V. Ya. Golovin, editorial party organizer, studied the detailed and profound analysis of the journal's activities over the past few years, described

in the KOMMUNIST survey (No 18, 1980), with great attention and satisfaction. They fully share the ideas expressed." The editors intend to devote all their efforts to insuring the all-round interpretation of basic problems of modern and most modern history and topics which, as was justifiably pointed out in the survey, have been insufficiently considered by the journal so far. The critical remarks were taken into consideration in the long-term work plan of the editors. The journal considers that close interaction with the big detachment of Soviet historians working in the field of modern and most modern history is a prerequisite for success in the elaboration of important scientific problems stemming from the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003
CSO: 1802/14 - END -

END OF FICHE DATE FILMED

9 Nov. 1981

D.D.